The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

AMID much to discourage Christians recent evidence that the Bible still retains a great hold on the people of this country comes like a river of water in a dry place. Cynics say that *The Bible as Literature* was given as a Christmas present by those who never read the Bible themselves. But the sale of the work continues, the illustrated *Story of the Bible* now appearing in instalments is also receiving a warm welcome, and there is widespread and deep interest in the coming commemoration of the Fourth Centenary of the "setting-up" of the English Bible. Congregationalists will play their part in these celebrations. The first public meeting in the May Meetings will deal with this subject, when the Dean of St. Paul's and Dr. Campbell Morgan will speak in the City Temple. In every city and town united meetings should be arranged; in emphasizing the place of the Bible in the life of the Church and the nation, Christians from all the Churches will realize their essential unity.

These celebrations should inspire ministers to start anew the biblical education of their congregations. They are aware that they cannot assume, as preachers could in the despised Victorian age, that biblical allusions will be generally understood; a modern congregation might be able to distinguish Gamaliel from Goliath, but many of them would be no wiser than the undergraduate who in a "Divvers" *viva* affirmed that he was "the bloke that fell out of the third storey window". The English Bible can be made a fascinating study, and we should like to hear that in every church small groups of people were meeting regularly to discover the treasures it contains. The marvel about the Bible is that it is ever fresh, that even at the hundredth time of reading a familiar passage will suggest new truth and give light and leading, solace and cheer. Recently we had to work again through two Bible books, *Jeremiah* and *Acts*: *Acts* we knew from long experience we should find inspiring, but *Jeremiah* had always been more or less a closed book: we knew its choice spots, just as we visit the Grand Canyon or the Yosemite, Niagara or the White Mountains, but the rest of the book was as unknown as the Middle West. It is almost impossible to describe the reward the student receives if he sets to work in earnest on a book like *Jeremiah*: that the Lord hath yet more light and truth to break forth from His Word was proved time and time again in this experience. The

modern man, yes, even the modern churchman, does not know what he is missing by leaving the Bible unopened. It is a fact, incredible as it may seem, that sometimes a request for a Bible in a Christian home results in embarrassment or in a prolonged search from which the housewife emerges with a duster as well as the desired volume. If the attention given to the Bible this year only restores it to the homes and hearts of Christian people a great step will have been taken toward the revival of true religion.

It needs to be emphasized, too, that the Old Testament is part of the Bible, despite the depreciation of it not uncommonly heard to-day. It is well to remember the contribution made by Greek thought to religion, and to discover the *prolegomena* of Christianity in divers places, but this must be in addition to, and never at the expense of, the Scriptures of the Old Testament. Time and time again preachers, in the North of England at any rate, have received from their hearers similar comments to this:

> Ah, it did me good to hear about David (or Lot, or Reuben, or Aaron, as the case may be). Them Old Testament chaps were very much like us.

Now that Hebrew is no longer compulsory in most theological colleges—and wisely so—there is all the more need that preachers should know the Old Testament, and be able to draw from psalmist and prophet, from the history of the Jewish people, and the lives of its men and women, lessons which will "find" the people of to-day.

* * *

THERE will be an opportunity during the May Assembly of the Congregational Union of England and Wales for Congregationalists to share with Methodists all over the world in giving thanks to God for the gift of John Wesley, who, on the 24th May, 1738, had a spiritual experience which resulted in a revival of religion which turned England upside down. It is always well to go back to sources, and in these days when religious figures—like other figures—are subject-matter for the historian and the dramatist, the play producer and the psychologist, it is advisable to read contemporary evidence. We wish all Methodists, and all our own readers, would in this bicentenary year read Wesley's *Journal* and his *Letters*—especially the *Journal*—and learn again what a man was enabled to do by the grace of God. It is a pity that the Religious Film Society has not the resources to make a full length film of Wesley's life—there is colour enough, and, as recent books have reminded us, feminine element enough, to make an outstanding film.

* * *

WHATSOEVER men—and nations—sow they also reap. If the peoples were not so blind and stupid, the state of the world to-day would

convince them that only in the recollection of this fundamental maxim, conveyed directly or indirectly in the Scriptures, is security to be found. North, South, East, and West we see how inexorably nemesis comes. A revengeful peace was imposed at Versailles—and the dragons' teeth have sprung up. The United States refused to honour their President's signature—and the debts owing to them were repudiated. The Allies refused to keep their promises to disarm—and Germany, rebuffed at times of great opportunity, sought in force her way of appeal to the world. The nations of the League failed to implement their promises—and Mussolini's appetite fed on eating. Everywhere the nations put their trust in arms—and the resort to arms, the terror of war, draws ever nearer.

Hitler dominates Austria; he will inevitably be driven, both by his written word and by the need for spectacular steps to impress his people and express the spirit he has fostered in them, to attack Czecho-Slovakia. That almost certainly means war, and probably in the end a German *Mittel-Europa* reaching from the Baltic to the Black Sea and the Mediterranean. And then? But ere then, if Czecho-Slovakia is assailed, France can scarcely avoid being drawn in, Russia will follow if circumstances are favourable, and then Japan. Britain will try to keep out, but she may not be able to do so. Italy will, as ever, wait to see which side is going to win, and go to its rescue! If she thinks she will gain more by remaining quiet until Germany's Near-Eastern ambitions are satisfied, and then uniting with her to threaten Britain's route to the East, she will do so. If Britain is drawn in, Italy will probably attack the vulnerable line of communication in the Mediterranean, stir up trouble in Egypt and Palestine, and endeavour to secure her ends in North Africa and Spain.

And all because nations forget that they reap what they sow. Mr. Eden's resignation implies that the Government has lost its faith in co-operation with the United States (and the isolationists in the United States are piling up a bill *they* will one day have to meet: even with a huge, self-sufficient country with a Pacific on one side and an Atlantic on the other, isolation in this little world is impossible) and in collective security. Its aim is a Four Power Pact, to which the parties will agree only so long as it suits them. Each government is wondering whether the others are better prepared for war and whether their peoples will support war, and hesitating whether to take the risk. Hitler and Mussolini, though no doubt convinced by now of the reality of Britain's rearmament, wonder what hold pacifism has in our country and how deep are the cracks in France's political structure. In case of war they would probably find that pacifism gave little trouble and that the French were Frenchmen first and foremost. The democratic countries wonder whether the Dictators dare risk war or whether the underground opposition would become

vocal and powerful, especially perhaps in Germany, and so the campaign be again lost on the home front. Nobody knows how far recent executions have diminished the effectiveness of the Russian armies, or whether those armies would stand the test of prolonged warfare. At any moment one of the Dictators might gamble on war. At any moment something, somewhere, might crack, and the world be plunged into chaos.

Amid all this the Christian Church is counting for less than nothing. The Pope is in the Duce's pocket, and his acquiescence in the rape of Abyssinia has forfeited his moral influence for this generation. While the other Churches discuss "Church, Community, and State", the States ignore the Church, and make plans in which those who comprise the community are food for cannon and targets for bombs. A general sense of impotence affects the Church, a mood which is a strange mixture of fear and fatalism broods over the peoples. No means have yet been found by which international Christianity can find expression, and the peoples drift into war while Christ's followers stand helplessly by. Few Christian folk are happy to think that the destinies of millions of lives are in the hands of the Neville Chamberlains, the John Simons, and the Duff Coopers, but there is no prospect of a satisfactory alternative Government: the Labour Party in the House of Commons showed its usual ineptness in handling the Eden resignation. It is clear that it is the Church of Christ and not the politicians which must save the world.

Perhaps the only redeeming feature in the situation—for it seems hopeless to expect that remorse and repentance will have come to those who by their folly and faithlessness at Versailles and Geneva are responsible—is the general recognition that the League is dead. It had to die; attached to its Siamese twin, the Versailles Treaty, it could not live. The Versailles Treaty has been dismembered piecemeal by Hitler, and the League has succumbed in the process. "The League is dead! Long live the League!" must be the cry. That it may come to birth without war must be the hope and prayer of all. But that can only be by the grace of God—for the seed has been sown the world over.

* * *

A Catechism for Marxists

"Religion is the opium of the people".

What sent men to the ends of the earth, enduring all manner of hardship to preach the Gospel?

The opium of the people.

What made them able to endure "in labour and travail, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness"?

The opium of the people.

What gave men courage and endurance when they were stoned, sawn asunder, slain with the sword?

The opium of the people.

What made humble men and women faithful unto death because they would not forsake the assembling of themselves together though Kings and Priests forbade?

The opium of the people.

What sent 102 people across the Atlantic in a vessel of 180 tons, taking 65 days on their journey, and finding such a land to colonize that in six months half of them were dead?

The opium of the people.

What made John Wesley travel for 50 years and more the length and breadth of the country, preaching often five times a day?

The opium of the people.

That Marx should have included in this description a religion whose basic words are "Launch out", "Go ye out", "Ye shall receive power" shows either his amazing blindness or the deplorable state of the organized religion of his day, or both.

If only mankind had known more of this remarkable sedative, the evils against which Marxists fight would long ago have been banished from the earth.

* * *

THE articles on Missionary policy and administration which have recently appeared in our pages will be followed next quarter by a contribution from the Rev. William Paton, Secretary of the International Missionary Council and Editor of the *International Review of Missions*. Those who know all that Mr. Paton has done for Christian Missions, and who have read that invaluable little book *Christianity in the Eastern Conflicts*, will look forward with eagerness to what he has to say about the future of Missions, and about the forthcoming Madras Conference. Meanwhile we hope that in preparation for this article readers will peruse the Rev. Roland Allen's *S. J. W. Clark* (World Dominion Press, 1s.) which contains on its cover these words:

> Foreign Missions are at a turning point in their history. Men at home and abroad are dissatisfied. Viewed as businesses they are badly conducted: viewed as spiritual movements they are confused and self-contradictory. Men are asking what is their real object and to that question they receive many conflicting answers. The very men engaged in them talk as if they were not sure what their object really is, and solemnly discuss in conferences what they really exist for, using language which has little relationship to their practice.

We are convinced that the movement in which Clark played so great a part, represented now by *World Dominion* and by such ideas as the indigenous church, voluntary clergy, and the Clark Bands, is an essential part of the missionary enterprise, and one from which the

denominational and other long established Societies have much to learn. How true these words of Clark's biographer are, not of missionary work alone, or even of Christian work alone:

> Unfortunately, most men shrink from any consideration which cuts at the root of their familiar practices. They have grown accustomed to certain methods of work, and they are eager to defend them against any uncomfortable intrusion. They do not want to weigh them against such wide responsibilities. They cannot face great issues. Consequently they flee from such thoughts to bury themselves in their habitual activities, and naturally seize upon the easy objection that the contemplation of such remote contingencies as evangelizing Z, whilst there is still much to be done in X and Y, is futile. That the existence of Z ought to affect all that they do in X or Y is beyond them; any radical change in their methods is to them either inconceivable, or, if conceivable, criminal.

* * *

A FORTNIGHT remains before the end of the L.M.S. financial year. At the moment of writing the amount received or promised toward the deficit of £76,000 is £62,268, and the promised increase of income £6,300. Church and individuals must remember that the time is short, and are urged to send their contributions immediately.

Looking forward to the future we are constrained to wonder if church officers are aware that one-half of the Society's income is received in the last fortnight of the financial year. Much of this is money which has been retained in the hands of Church or Auxiliary Treasurers for many months—a deplorable habit which results in quite avoidable payment of interest. Monies should be sent as soon as received, and churches which budget an annual sum should follow the example of some of the best commercial firms who pay quarterly dividends, and send their contributions not in one sum at the end of the year, but quarter by quarter.

* * *

IN Dr. C. R. Watson's *What is This Moslem World?*, reviewed within, there are some important pages devoted to missionary strategy. Quoting Dr. J. R. Mott's words that if ten great cities of the non-Christian world could be occupied we should be assured of the ultimate advance of Christianity throughout the world, the author applies this specially to Islam. He goes on to suggest that most important of all in working out this strategy is the question of personnel, the securing of men and women properly qualified and in placing and using them:

> Cairo, for illustration, is a city of over 1,250,000, the capital of the country, the intellectual centre of Islam, a seething cauldron of modernism and traditionalism, Westernism and Orientalism, culture and commerce, nationalism and Islamism.

> Why not recognize, therefore, that Christianity will require at such a centre as Cairo, and others like it, men quite above the average, who may, on a common level of education, ability, and personal force, meet and speak with the Moslem intelligentsia of such centres?

The need for men of specialized gifts and training for technical tasks is emphasized, and the need, in Dr. J. A. Mackay's words, for some to

> take up a missionary relationship to the total missionary situation? What we want is not more research or more data. We have had an abundance of both. What we need is time and capacity for clear seeing, conclusive thinking and decisive action.

But with this placing of specialists in strategic positions there must come the use of the layman in missionary work. There should be sent out into education and business life men and women fully equipped to serve in these spheres who nevertheless go to their posts because they are Christians and with the aim of spreading Christianity. They are to be the focus to which others attach themselves when they become Christians.

* * *

After fifteen years the Archbishops' Commission has presented its report on *Doctrine in the Church of England* (S.P.C.K., 4s. and 2s. 6d.). The Commission has contained some of the most distinguished theologians in the Church, and their findings deserve the attention of Christian thinkers in all Communions, even though the Commission has kept itself strictly to its task:

> To consider the nature and grounds of Christian doctrine with a view to demonstrating the extent of existing agreement within the Church of England and with a view to investigating how far it is possible to remove or diminish existing differences.

It would be possible to give many pages to the discussion of this Report, which is introduced by the Archbishop of York with his usual clarity of thought and expression—a clarity, by the way, not always maintained in the pages which follow. There is much in the Report which will afford satisfaction to Free Churchmen, but so often when recognizing what might be called the Free Church position there are qualifications and ambiguous phrases. This is the Report's understanding of "The priesthood of all believers":

> The fundamental priesthood of the Church is thus the priesthood of the whole Body. This is the meaning of the doctrine of the priesthood of the laity, a doctrine which does not mean that laymen are individually priests, but that the laity are, as such, members of that Body which is in its entirety priestly.

When this is put side by side with the reiterated emphasis on the Ministry as "an original and essential element in the Church" deriv-

ing its commission not from the Church but from Christ Himself, it is seen how little significance really attaches to the priesthood of the laity.

> Some of us are unable to adhere to tradition so strictly in this matter as to affirm that the Eucharist cannot in any circumstances be celebrated by a lay person acting with due intention and using sufficient form and matter. But even those of us who would affirm that the sacrament so celebrated ought to be reckoned as valid, though irregular, would agree that it is wrong for a lay person to attempt to celebrate the Eucharist except in the most abnormal circumstances.

Even the finest passage in the Report is followed immediately by a narrowing and qualifying interpretation :

> We believe that there has come a change in our outlook which must be fully acknowledged. We no longer regard precedents, as such, as decisive for all time. Their authority depends upon the principles which they embody and upon the conformity of those principles to the Mind of Christ.

Will it be believed that immediately, instead of going on to stress the freedom wherewith Christ has made us free, the Report goes on ? :

> Indeed the principles of Church Order in the most general sense are grounded in the Being of God, who "is not a God of confusion but of peace". Further, the Church, as the fellowship of Christians, is the people and flock of which Christ is "Shepherd and Bishop". Its order and structure are necessarily such as to provide the means through which He may exercise His oversight and pastoral care. In this sense provision for pastoral oversight—*Episcope*—is an essential element in the life of the Church.

In regard to the Scriptures there are welcome signs of progress, and a frankness which has not always marked Anglican pronouncements. The whole section dealing with Scripture is a defence of critical scholarship. The chapter on God and Redemption is well worth study : here too there is candid admission of variety of opinion ; the Archbishop of York feels obliged to make clear that he himself accepts both the Virgin Birth and the Physical Resurrection of Jesus.

* * *

We retain the promised comments on recent pronouncements on the Sacraments until the next issue because we want to associate with them references to the Sacraments in the above Report and in the *Outline of a Reunion Scheme*. In the meantime we ask readers to ponder this paragraph from that *Outline*, the work of a Conference which included, be it remembered, 18 Free Churchmen :

> Those only shall be members of the united Church of England who have *by Baptism* been admitted to Christ's Church visible on earth.

The italics are ours, as they are in this footnote which the *Outline* attaches to the above words:

> No one who believes that Jesus Christ commanded His disciples to baptize or that His first disciples from the first beginning did so, could consent to any other rule of membership in His Church, but when the Church in unity has that wisdom which it lacks in its divisions, it will have to consider *what fellowship it can give* to devoted followers of Christ like the Friends who do not use sacraments, supposing that they on their part desire fellowship with the Church which provides sacraments, and with its members who use them.

"What fellowship it can give"! How charitable! How humble! How Christ-like! The attempt to say that the Church must be united before it can decide about the Friends and those who do not use Sacraments was made at Edinburgh and immediately rejected. No doubt it was suggested by the same active mind at Lambeth, and the Free Churchmen let it through. We must, that is to say, keep out those who stand pre-eminently for the present guidance of the Spirit until the Spirit tells us what we can do about them! Lest we cease to be parliamentary we pass on to the next business.

* * *

It might have been assumed as axiomatic that the representatives of the Church of England and the Free Churches would avoid such an elementary strategic mistake as issuing documents about Church Union bearing the names of 34 clerics and not a single layman (Sir Henry Lunn makes the best of both worlds). The constitution of the Joint Committee is sufficient in itself to explain the clerical and scholastic tone of the documents. Although far too responsible and correct to put their views in the language of the Anglo-Catholic curate who could never understand why God Almighty made the laity, the negotiators reflect a good deal of his spirit. Church Union, when it comes, and if it is to be genuine, must grow from below, and begin between Christian congregations in the parishes; it will never be more than a sham if imposed by clerical statesmen nicely fitting awkwardly shaped pieces together. Once more we would urge that it is by united efforts, especially united evangelism, that Christians will realize their unity.

Altogether we marvel at the patience of laymen, for they often get a "raw deal". There are hundreds of churches where men and women, the salt of the earth, not merely make great financial sacrifices for their churches, but give the whole of their leisure time to serving them; night after night they are to be found on church buildings at work with organizations of one kind and another. We wonder if sufficient use is made of them in the work of organized Congregationalism. The complaints so frequently made about the absence of young men on denominational committees is, of course,

largely to be accounted for by the fact that those committees always meet during the day when younger men are earning their livings. When a County Union covers a wider area, it is no doubt impossible for its Committee to meet in the evening, but we wonder if a compact County Union like the London Union has ever tried the experiment of holding its Council meetings in the evenings to secure the help of younger laymen. This suggestion will no doubt be found altogether revolutionary: "The ministers wouldn't be able to come". Well, if they were in their churches relieving some of the lay folk who are there every night, and allowing them to bring their practical experience to the service of the denomination, would it not be a good thing? When we are feeling so much the loss of the war generation, it is all the more important that in denominational life we should have the post-war men and women. To have organized religion almost entirely in charge of men and women brought up in the pleasant environment of the late 19th and early 20th century is almost enough in itself to explain its parlous state. It is so difficult—we almost said impossible—for those who belong to that generation to remember the different outlook of post-war youth, of those who have never known that confident security which marked the life of 1890-1910. "Do you realize", said one of them, "that I've never known what it is to feel that the world is safely at peace, that I could feel sufficient security of life and employment to marry and have a family?" That is why the negotiating Churches have made an even bigger mistake than that of limiting the conversations to the professional clergy—they have excluded, too, those who are to be members of this united Church of the future. Only one of the thirty-four is under fifty and the average age is well over 60. *O sancta simplicitas*!

* * *

If there is one thing clear about the future of religion it is that the Church will have to become much more of a teaching Church if she is to live. In the history of the Church those periods have been most potent in the influencing of life and history when she has been giving herself with all her might to the training of both young and old. Dr. A. Mitchell Hunter has recently written an article on "The Educational Work of John Calvin" in which he reminds his readers that, as a result of the work done in Calvin's school in Geneva, a boy could give an answer for his faith as ably as a Professor of the Sorbonne. To-day it is comparatively infrequent to find a Christian of older growth prepared and able to give an account of the faith that is in him, and until Christians can do that naturally they will not make their full impression on the world. If the Lord's Supper were to be celebrated in Calvin's College in Geneva its significance was expounded to the pupils during the preceding week. If something like this were done for a generation perhaps the Churches

would not be in the confused state of mind in which they find themselves in regard to sacraments.

* * *

We do not hear to-day as often as once we did that "a parson only works one day a week". There are slack parsons in every Church; sometimes worship is conducted and sermons preached that are an offence to both God and man. But it is probably true to say that the proportion of Christian ministers who take their work seriously is greater than ever before. The problem that confronts the conscientious minister is how rightly to dispose of his time. Sermon preparation and hard study of a chosen subject make a considerable demand; pastoral visitation and work among teachers and children are essential; some oversight of a medley of societies is wise if one has a city church. And then we have left out altogether, except in so far as the first is included under pastoral visitation:

(*i*) Individual work. The minister must, we are told, always have time to listen, must be prepared to give many hours to help a single individual, must never give the impression that he is in a hurry.

(*ii*) Outside work, not merely such as the Free Church Council and the Sunday School Union, but the C.O.S., Guild of Help, Care Committees, School Management—and a thousand and one other things.

We were set thinking on these lines by a mysterious volume, Mr. J. C. Pringle's *Social Work in the London Churches* (Oxford Press, 5s.) which is said to be an account of the Metropolitan Visiting and Relief Association, 1843-1937. We say mysterious because it is never made clear who is writing: sometimes it is "the present writer"; sometimes "we", with a reference to "our two Associations". Sometimes (p. 98) lines seem to have dropped out; sometimes letters (p. 269) are intrusive. But all the muddle is due to Mr. Pringle's enthusiasm, and he has something to say which ministers of all Churches ought to read. It is that huge State social services do not rule out personal service, that the substitution of arithmetic and statistics for such service is disastrous, and that there is as much need as ever in the parishes for family case-work of the kind the Metropolitan Visiting and Relief Association and the C.O.S. exist to do. Mr. Pringle wisely quotes Mr. Peter Scott:

> I want to give the men a chance to dig their souls out of the soil and so possess them again. No staff is of any use whatever for my purpose that is not animated one hundred per cent by the religious motive.

The social legislation of the Liberal Government of 1906 and the coming of the War gave a great blow to this kind of work, and Mr. Pringle appeals to the leaders of the Church of England and the

clergy to secure its resuscitation. This is quite on sound lines. But there are two questions we must put to Mr. Pringle:

1. How is the average clergyman or minister to be sufficient for all these things?

2. Why does he write as if no other Church but the Anglican exists? How does he think the old parochial idea is to function in an entirely new situation when in a parish there are probably more non-Anglicans than Anglicans?

* * *

MOST of us complain at times of this or that feature in the programmes of the B.B.C., but it is generally agreed that the B.B.C. performs its difficult task very efficiently. It is impossible to suit all tastes—Bohemian and Puritan, highbrow and lowbrow, religious and secular. One or two bad mistakes have been made lately. The censoring of Grey Owl's final broadcast to children because it was "controversial"—he asked them not to engage in fox-hunting—was pusillanimous in the extreme. Then why are we given these daily accounts of the schemes of boxing promoters? Boxing is an admirable sport for youths and young men, but the prize-fights which are arranged in England as well as on the Continent and in the United States are simply the exploitation of brutality. By all means let sport have its place in the news; but why give a free advertisement to a business which panders to the worst in human nature?

* * *

MRS. HORTON has gallantly accepted the Treasurership of the Congregational Theological Conference, founded by Dr. Horton a dozen years ago. Thanks to the generosity of a few friends, and especially of Mr. A. B. Russell, the Treasurer, by whose death the Lyndhurst Road Church and the Conference have lost a truly great Christian gentleman, it has been possible to invite as guests to the Conference a number of younger ministers likely to benefit by its fellowship. It is hoped to continue this custom, and Mrs. Horton will gladly acknowledge gifts addressed to 16 Christchurch Hill, Hampstead, London, N.W.3.

* * *

READERS of this journal have frequently asked for a collection of the articles which have appeared under the heading "On Life and Books". Such a volume will shortly be published, but it will have a wider range than this section of the *Congregational Quarterly*. Under the title *Thirty-Five to Fifty* it will include between an article which appeared in the first number, "A Young Congregationalist to Young Congregationalists", and one entitled "On Reaching Fifty" a selection from editorial contributions and comment over fifteen years. Full particulars are given in the prospectus included in this number. The price of the volume, obtainable from any book-

seller or from Independent Press, will be 5s. The publishers are, of course, unable to offer any concession to subscribers of the *Congregational Quarterly,* but the Editor has arranged that they—and they only—may obtain copies at 4s. each (4s. 6d. post free) by filling in the special order form included in this issue, and posting it to him at the Memorial Hall, E.C.4.

* * *

FROM Mr. Basil Henriques' *The Indiscretions of a Warden.*

> The boys were asked to write an essay on their holidays. One fellow had been to Llandudno, and in his description had named the place six times . . . and spelt it right each time. So pleased was the teacher that he called the boy out, and told him to write it on the blackboard. . .
>
> "I can't", said the boy.
> "Don't be silly; you have just spelt it correctly six times".
> "Yes, but I've eaten my rock"!

> The psychiatrists do not do their work with the thoroughness of some of the Americans. I was privileged to attend a conference of the workers who had been dealing with a case which had been remanded for a psychological report in America. The child had, I think, stolen an apple. One worker reported on the home, another on the school, another on his emotional tests, another on his mental tests, another on his physique, another on his employment. It was all very interesting, but so far as I could gather (the psychiatrist had a bad cold at the time, and it was difficult to hear what he was saying through his handkerchief) the final conclusion was the child's maternal grandmother had had a sex complex.

* * *

"Are you saved, brother?"
"No, I went to Sunday School".

THE THEOLOGY OF H. R. MACKINTOSH.

By Dr. T. Hywel Hughes.

By the death of Dr. Hugh Ross Mackintosh, Professor of Systematic Theology at New College, Edinburgh, theological learning in Britain has suffered a greater loss than any sustained since the passing of P. T. Forsyth. Of the many gaps made by death in recent days—for we have lost such stalwarts as Hastings Rashdall, Von Hügel, and Streeter—none was so profoundly felt as that of the Scottish thinker who gave of his best to his generation and literally burnt himself out on the altar of sacred truth and service. It is remarkable that no attempt has been made in his own land to evaluate his work and to assign him a place in the hierarchy of Christian scholars. There have been thoughtful notices in some of the continental journals and in certain of the American magazines—Dr. Mackintosh was well known in both regions—but there has only been one short article in a religious weekly in this land. This was written by one of his old students, now a professor in Glasgow University. The present article is an attempt to make a brief estimate of his work.

I do not claim any special fitness for the task. Many in Scotland could do it better. I can, however, claim to have known Mackintosh with growing intimacy for fourteen years, to have worked with him in the Edinburgh Post-graduate School of Theology, and to have esteemed him and his work more deeply and wholeheartedly as the years have passed. A man of kindly, gracious spirit, the core of his teaching was an elaboration and enhancement of the grace of God in Jesus Christ. Shortly after the publication of *The Christian Experience of Forgiveness* he confessed to me that he had found greater joy in writing that book than in anything he had ever done, adding that he thought this was due to the fact that he was dealing with the basic factor in Christianity, the grace of God in forgiveness.

Probably future generations will assign the place of honour to his volume, *The Person of Christ*, a monumental work of vast labour and patient scholarship. In it he grapples with the implications and basal principles of Incarnation and Divine indwelling. On this aspect it still stands unassailable as his best work. He confessed that he was not at home in historical studies, and on this side there is little that is fresh and much that has been gleaned from secondary sources. But even here we note the same meticulous care and scrupulous examination of details. It is on the constructive philosophical and theological sides that the book will continue to bear its witness. The same care is found in all he wrote. His manuscripts were worked over again and again until he was fully satisfied; only then were they allowed to go to press. This accounts for the easy flow of style, the amazing

poise and smoothness of diction, and the unfailing clarity of thought.

Mackintosh's training in philosophy gave him a grasp of the basic principles of thought. Although he kept abreast of modern movements in philosophy, his own preferences were for the older schools. He had little sympathy with the modern psychological emphasis, and was impatient with the claims of Psycho-analysis and the New Psychology. It is evident, however, that he had not neglected to study this movement, for his volume on "Forgiveness" reveals a firm grasp of its main aspects. Not many British theologians have enjoyed so great a reputation on the Continent. In his student days he studied at Freiburg, Halle, and Marburg. At the latter he was profoundly influenced by Herrmann, who stimulated his interest in Schleiermacher and Ritschl. Whilst well acquainted with many phases of theological thought, German theology remained his chief interest. He was probably the best informed student of Barth in this country, and his knowledge of his master, Ritschl, was unrivalled, except perhaps by that of Dr. Garvie. The volume published after his death, *Types of Modern Theology*, reveals his intimacy with the movements within German theology. The same may also be seen from the fact that, with the help of a friend, he translated Schleiermacher's *Christliche Glaube*, as well as the greater part of Ritschl's chief work, *Justification and Reconciliation*. Were these translations his only service, he would have laid the English-speaking world under an incalculable debt. But he has written on all the great truths of the Christian Faith, and everything is marked by the same clarity of thought and diction, by ripe scholarship and deep spiritual insight. It would be possible to find a compendium of theology in his writings, although he never attempted such a task himself.

It was no secret to his friends that he became more orthodox as the years passed. I had occasion, whilst writing *The New Psychology and Original Sin,* to consult him with reference to his article on "Sin" in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics,* in which he goes a long way towards repudiating the Augustinian position. He replied that he had come to see that the position there advocated was unsound, and that he would not then stand by it since he had drawn much closer to the standpoint of Augustine. It is clear, however, that he never accepted the doctrine of total depravity. In his *Types of Modern Theology* he condemns Ritschl for having "turned the Augustinian doctrine of Original Sin out of doors", and he speaks of "our nature being antagonistic to God" (p. 177).

In intercourse with him I became aware that he grew more and more sympathetic to the Barthian position. He was at first repelled by the stark and rugged distinctions of Barth, as well as by his style, and he was irritated by the unbending character of "either . . or". He was also dubious of the uncertain position given to the *imago Dei* in the Barthian system. It is noteworthy that in his lectures on Barth

he strove continually to tone down the strident antinomies of Barth, to smooth over the ragged edges of his antitheses so as to make apology for some of the outstanding and less defensible weaknesses of the Barthian scheme.

Mackintosh was ever a cautious thinker, and too sincere to venture far from the realm of assured truth. He was forced by his own experience, as well as by the condition of religion in his day, to come to anchorage in the basic truths wrung out of the Christian experience of the past and sanctioned by the corporate thought and faith of the Church.

He was strongly opposed to Mysticism, and in this he reflects Herrmann. It would not be difficult to show that his condemnation was not quite fair. Some of his criticisms may hold with reference to certain spurious and exaggerated forms of mysticism, but they certainly are not valid in relation to the sane and pure type of mystics. The main grounds of his antagonism were: (i) mysticism tends "to dissolve the Person of Christ into sub-personal factors" . . so that "the exalted Christ vanishes in a mist of sentimentalism and dialectic"; (ii) it is "unhistorical in basis and character, and perhaps also uninterested in morality". Though he thus viewed emotion in religion with a critical eye, he saw the value of it in all personal experience of fellowship with God. In the experience of forgiveness he realized that it was basal. What he feared was excessive emotionalism and weak sentimentalism, for he had the usual Scottish dread of over-much feeling. His careful evaluation of the place of feeling in religion in his lecture on Schleiermacher makes clear his standpoint.

Coming closer to his view of religion in general we note that he remained true to the Kantian position, regarding the moral consciousness as ultimate and making the ethical the basis of the real. This led him to treat the religious consciousness as dependent upon, or derivative from, the moral consciousness. In line with this, he held that the basis of his faith in God was rooted in the ethical ground of his being, and that the religious relationship was derived from this. "After all we lay hold on God by the strongest thing in us, our sense of right" (*Forgiveness*, p. 236). Now we might well ask whether love is not stronger and more fundamental than the sense of right, though it cannot be at its best without the sense of right. Do we not lay hold on God by the whole of our personality? Is not the bond one of love, a love that is the outpouring and self-donation of the *whole* self? Not merely by the sense of right, then, nor mainly by it, do we become united to God and enter into the fellowship with Him which is the core of personal religion. Great as is the contribution of the Idealistic School—represented by Pringle-Pattison and others—with which Mackintosh had kinship, we must decline to follow them when they ask us to believe that the religious consciousness is secondary to the moral consciousness or treat the moral

consciousness as determinative of religion. This is to rob religion of its supremacy, to subordinate it to the jurisdiction of a partial aspect of human personality. In reality the religious consciousness is not thus subject to the moral. It is itself basic, and we are beginning to realize that the three other aspects of conscious life—the rational, the æsthetic, and the moral—are derived from this. The category of the "Holy" is being recognized as supreme, and is taking its place in philosophic thought as basic to all conscious life. The religious life must most certainly be moral, but it must also be something more. The moral attitude may and does lead to a fine and noble stringency in life, and yields practical service of great value, but such a life lacks something that religion at its best contributes to man. Westcott, discussing the spheres of Reason, Morality, and Art, is led to say[1]:

> Religion in its completeness is the harmony of these three, of Philosophy, Ethics, and Art, blended into one by a spiritual force, by a consecration at once personal and absolute. . . . . Religion includes their several ends, but adds to them that in which they find their consummation, the Holy. The Holy brings an infinite sanction to that which is otherwise finite and relative.

The relation of religion and morality is difficult to define, but, whatever it is, it surely cannot be one in which morality is the determinative factor. The other aspects have their claim and they will not be denied. Religion implicates the whole man at a deeper level and in a more concrete wholeness than the ethical, springing from and influencing the central core of man's personal life. It yields a satisfaction that morality cannot give. In the final issue, the goal of the ethical quest is a flying goal, the search ends in a *cul-de-sac*. It is a struggle not an achievement. In religion we achieve and our personality finds peace. In certain moods Mackintosh seems to have seen deeper into this question, for in his treatment of forgiveness he declares that "morality is not enough". He disapproves of Ritschl because "the standards and presuppositions of the moral man are allowed to lay down the law to the believing mind" and his teaching "is seldom touched with the wonderful feeling of the New Testament".

The Person of Christ. Mackintosh's *The Person of Christ* is most comprehensive and thorough, dealing, not only with the History of the doctrine, but also with its Biblical, Philosophical, Psychological, and Theological aspects in a suggestive and enlightening manner. When it was first published in 1912 he was comparatively unknown, but this work at once placed him among the front rank of British theologians. Nothing since published on the subject has furnished so complete a study of the various aspects of Christology. Mackintosh leaves us in no doubt as to where he stands: he accepts the full

[1] *The Religion of the West*, 343 f.

essential deity of Christ, maintaining consistently His uniqueness and authority. Two brief quotations will make his position clear. Considering the *locus classicus, Matt.* 11[16], and emphasizing the priority and basal position of Christ's filial consciousness, he proceeds[2]:

> Jesus' incommunicable consciousness of oneness with the Eternal is a new thing in the world. . . . What it is of supreme moment for us to note is the unqualified correlation of Father and Son these words proclaim. We are brought face to face with a relationship *of absolute intimacy and perfect mutual correspondence which* is intransferable by its nature. Not only is the Father's being, *to its inmost secret,* open to the soul of Jesus without that sense of mystery and inscrutable remoteness of which the greatest prophets had been conscious; not merely is the Son's knowledge of the Father complete, final, and inaccessible to every other save those to whom the Son is mediator; along with this goes the fact that Jesus' inmost being is known to the Father and to no one else. . . . Between Jesus and God, one may say, all things are common. . . . In His case alone Sonship is the constitutive factor of His being. . . . There is no reason why we should not use the word "metaphysical" to denote this special Sonship, not as though metaphysical stood in contrast with ethical, but to mark the circumstance that *this Sonship is part of the ultimate realities of being.* . . . It is clear that His consciousness of unique Sonship lifts Him beyond the plane of normal human life.

He returns to this question of unity and filial consciousness in his treatment of the Johannine witness to Christ, and there he brings out other aspects of the relationship.

> The secret of His uniqueness lies in an unparalleled relation to the Father. Men can be children of God only by the new birth; Jesus is the Son of God by eternal nature. . . This unity has often been described (by Beyschlag and others) as if, in the last resort, it were limited and defective, a unity merely of purpose and will. And the objection is no doubt well taken provided we agree that "will" is something less and lower than ultimate reality. If behind all will and thought there exists in God a mysterious, irrecognizable substance not to be described in terms familiar to man's experience, but representing the point through which the threads of cosmic relations pass and constituting the inner essence of the Divine life, then indeed the oneness of Christ with God is after all only relative. But the supposition is mistaken. There is in the universe nothing more real than "will", the living energy of spirit; nothing more concrete and actual, whether it be in God or man; it is the last home and sanctuary of essential being[3].

We might find some difficulty in following him in his treatment of

[2] Pp. 26-7. [3] Pp. 101 f.

the two natures in Christ, but his interpretation of the pre-existence of Christ, of the Kenotic theories, and of the self-limitation of Christ is especially illuminating. We cannot doubt his grasp upon, and realization of, the full and essential Godhead of Jesus.

In this early aspect of his thought we can faintly see the first tokens of a view which afterwards became central to all his conception of the Work of Christ. This is that the doctrine of the deity of Christ was originally an inference from what Christ had done for the apostles. He had done for them what only God could do, and so, in spite of their strict monotheistic training, they were driven by the logic of their own experience to find a place for Jesus within the circle of deity.

Mackintosh had no sympathy with the immanentism so prevalent in certain circles to-day; he insisted that there were transcendental elements in Jesus that could not be forced into the immanental mould. The movement to split the consciousness of Jesus into Messianic, Filial, and Redemptive factors found no favour with him, for these were to him more or less abstractions. He was content to rest all on the Filial consciousness, which he regarded as the background of all Christ's thought and experience, colouring and determining everything else. He did not take kindly to the psychological approach to the Person of Christ, nor was he enamoured of the distinction made between the Christ of history and the Christ of experience; he felt that the deepest and richest Christian experience is still mediated through the Christ of history, and that in this matter He has uniqueness and finality. The subordination of Jesus is discussed with simplicity and reverence, Mackintosh insisting that this is ethical subordination, and, in the final issue, as represented in *1 Cor.* 15, it is self-imposed as an aspect of Christ's self-limitation.

The Work of Christ. *The Christian Experience of Forgiveness* reveals the core of Mackintosh's teaching as well as the heart of his personal religion. Forgiveness, for him, "shows the nature of God more than anything else", and forgiveness is not merely the removal of penalty. It is restored harmony with God. "Atonement is what it cost God to be able to forgive". Forgiveness is always costly even in God. I know of no other work in which the experience of being forgiven and the inspiration derived from that experience have been so tenderly and Christianly portrayed. The central thought is the love of God in the grace of forgiveness. There is no doubt that Forsyth's influence upon Mackintosh was at this point very strong. His final view is of an objective atonement and a penal satisfaction, but he belongs to the Forsythian wing rather than that of Dale and Denney. Like Forsyth he stresses the "Holiness of God", and the Cross as its expression. The love from which the gospel springs is "holy love". Mackintosh had a kindly feeling towards the theory of Macleod Campbell—the vicarious penitence of Christ—and he pays

a generous tribute to Campbell in his *Aspects of Religious Thought*. But he parts company with him on the ground that an atonement must mean something to God, something that costs and is realized in God's nature and experience. He finds it difficult to understand how the vicarious penitence of Christ can have any meaning for the Father. He touches sympathetically on many views in this volume —Moral Influence, Ransom, Expiatory Sacrifice—and he was evidently drawn to certain aspects of Moberly's view, especially in connecting Calvary with Pentecost. Like Forsyth again, he insists that the Atonement is completed in the Resurrection. It is the living Christ that saves. Sin is

> something so real and dark that only three modes of Divine treatment are possible—to judge it, to bear it in sacrificial love, to forgive it freely. All these are present in the great act and experience of God which we call the Atonement (p. 171).

The act and experience of God in reconciling the world to Himself is "the wonder of wonders", "a miracle", and "the greatest miracle". Forgiveness is the mightiest act of God and it takes all the Godhead in its Triune ministry of power and grace to redeem and save man. How greatly does he exalt the grace of God and the love of the Father! Here are some of the adjectives which he uses in endeavouring to express it: unimaginable, incredible, inestimably precious, amazing, exhaustless, passing knowledge, unspeakable, stupendous, astoundingly great, and many others expressing the superlatives of worth. How sure and unfailing is the principle by which he proceeds in insisting that all views have finally to be tested by the truth of the Fatherhood of God and the self-giving love which is the determining element of this Fatherhood! How consistently does he emphasize the place of experience in understanding the cross! Only a saved soul can understand its secret. Yet it is doubtful if anyone can understand it, nor can any final theory be stated, for experience grows so that the demands on the saving grace of God are changing. But whatever changes may come the Cross is equal to them all, and in this respect it has finality.

This is a great treatment of Atonement and Forgiveness, and there are but few things that may be said of it by way of criticism. First, we may express the wish that Mackintosh had co-ordinated the different views expressed in the book. They have been left with ragged ends, as it were, and not brought into a real unity. Secondly, there is undoubtedly too rigid an emphasis on the wrath of God. One of his main objections to Ritschl's view is that it lays no emphasis on the wrath of God, and he quotes with approval[4] the saying of Herrmann: "Ritschl's denial of the wrath of God was a great sin against the Christian soul". Moreover he tends, with Brunner, to identify the wrath of God with His holiness.

[4] *Types*, 159.

It is clear that here again we see the influence of Forsyth on Mackintosh's mind, for the emphasis is quite the same, as well as the ground on which it is based. Forsyth had interpreted the phrase "Wrath of God" on the background of the Divine holiness, insisting that it implies the anger, or even the enmity, of God. Wrath is the reaction of an ethical personality against wrong, the energy of holiness in opposition to unrighteousness. With this Mackintosh agrees, though a little hesitatingly. But he does imply and say that it means the anger of God and that the death of Christ removes this anger, this being one aspect of the objectivity of the Atonement.

It would be somewhat difficult to square this position with Mackintosh's own principle that nothing can be accepted that is in opposition to the central truth of God's Fatherhood, and equally difficult to attribute anger or enmity to a personality ethically perfect. On the highest human level a child's wrong-doing does not stir real anger in a parent's heart. Rather does it bring pain, agony, sorrow, and distress. If we are to maintain the New Testament basis of love, even though we qualify it and call it "holy love", we must not forget that it is still a Father's love, and it is difficult, if not impossible, to regard the Great Father as actually angry at the wrong-doing of His children. Resentment, perhaps; opposition and estrangement, yes! but not anger. Mackintosh would probably reply that this position imperils the ethical perfection of God, but I do not see why it should. It is most likely that this ascription of anger to the Father arises from the fact that so many thinkers, all along the ages, have lost sight of the truth that the supreme interest with God, as with every true father, is not sin but the sinner, and that the final question is not that of punishing sin but of saving the sinner. This is a charge that can be made against most of the advocates of the penal theory of the Atonement. It should be clear also that it is not necessary to hold the penal view in order to secure the objectivity of the Atonement. It may, indeed, be objective in quite another sense, and one more in harmony with the New Testament and the Fatherhood of God.

It is probable that the trouble here is due to the position taken in making "holiness" basal instead of "love". Forsyth stresses the holiness of God as primary, making love a mode of its activity, and in this Mackintosh follows him, although he never fails to magnify the wonder of God's love, as we have seen. Indeed, he has a great passage in *Types of Modern Theology*[5] which, if fully accepted, would have saved him from an excessive emphasis on holiness:

> If we take "love" seriously, analysing its implications, it will be seen as involving the Divine personality, *and all other attributes of God* which it is the interest of Christian faith to affirm.

Now a good case can be made out for the view that this emphasis on

[5] P. 158.

"holiness" is really a false emphasis, and untrue to the New Testament. There can be no doubt that the New Testament stresses "love" as the essential nature of God, much more decisively than it does holiness. It is never once said that God is holiness, though it is said that He is holy; it is the adjective not the substantive that is applied to Him, seeming to imply that holiness is of the nature of an attribute rather than His substantive nature. On the other hand, we do find it stated that "God is love", and that the gospel is an expression and revelation of this love. The gospel is also spoken of as a revelation of the righteousness of God, as the justification of God and His judgment on the sin of man. But this very revelation is the outcome of love and its end is the kindling of love in the heart of the sinner, so that he may enter into fellowship with the Father and enjoy the warmth of the home that was lost. Mackintosh thinks that "faith" and not love is the characteristic human response to God in the New Testament, largely on the ground of Paul's view of justification by faith. But there can be little doubt of the primacy of "love" even here, for the deepest New Testament conception of "faith" is that of receptivity, surrender, or openness of soul. But such faith is not its own explanation; neither is the attitude of repentance, which Mackintosh also stresses, capable of explaining itself. They imply something beyond themselves, and this is the love of the heart, prompting self-giving, and yielding an attitude of receptivity which makes possible the acceptance of God's gift of grace. Again, repentance is only possible when man perceives wrong-doing to be, not merely a breach of law, but an outrage on love. We certainly get nearer the New Testament view, and understand the truth and reality of the whole situation more fully if we accept love as the essential being of God. Holiness may be regarded as the mode of love's operation conditioning the effectual working of Divine self-giving. When the approach and self-donation of love fails to find response and amendment in man it reacts as punishment, but only as secondary to the prior appeal of God's love and self-giving. Because the appeal of love had failed it became necessary for God to intervene in Atonement.

There is a further difficulty here in that the concept of holiness is still vague and lacking in definiteness and clarity. It has been taken—by the post-Reformation theologians, for example—almost as equivalent to the punitive justice of God, and as such separate from or even opposed to, Divine love. Although Mackintosh deprecates such a separation, he tends to treat the holiness of God as His moral consciousness. The vagueness of the conception is found even in Scripture. As is well known, there are in the Old Testament two main ideas. On one hand, holiness is the aloofness of God from all that suggests creatureliness, His separation from all created things. This is clearly an effort to lay emphasis on the distinction between

spirit and matter. It develops in later Jewish thought into the idea of Divine transcendence, removing God from contact with the world and making intermediaries necessary to link Him to the world. When ethical considerations enter here, the emphasis is on the separation of God from all evil, a moral transcendence that keeps Him from even looking on evil. It would be difficult to get any conception of forgiveness on this ground. Another conception of holiness is found in the prophets. "Holiness" is the element which makes God different from man, His divineness. Again it is not easy to understand how He could approach man, or how man could acquire fellowship with Him. The New Testament does not make the idea any clearer except that holiness is brought into relation with Divine love, constituting an element in the Fatherhood of God. In distinction from this vague idea we feel that love is at least a concrete reality, and Fatherhood is understandable. It is "holy love"; but surely it must be the love relationship that is basic to all, and so to the work of Christ. It appears to me that the emphasis on holiness does tend, in spite of all protestations to the contrary, to obscure the basic position of Fatherhood and love. It must be added, however, that even love cannot forgive unconditionally, and in this fact we are to find the ground for an objective Atonement. Forgiveness from God can never come to man in such a way as to endanger man's moral personality. To safeguard personality both in God and man some objective element is necessary in an atoning act. Mackintosh's treatment of forgiveness will yield satisfaction to many by extolling the grace of God and appealing to the Christian experience of the ages in support of his position. Through all his treatment there breathes a fine Christian spirit and an attitude of devout surrender and homage to Jesus Christ.

It is too soon to estimate aright the place of Dr. Mackintosh in the theological thought of the ages. But we may rest assured that when the time comes he will be made to stand high, very high, in the ranks of those who have contributed to the clarity and the grandeur of Christian truth in an age of superficial thinking and moral laxity. He will be found to have helped to put Jesus on the throne, and to have done a great part in bringing in the Kingdom of Truth and Love.

THE DISADVANTAGES OF BEING A LONDONER

By the Rev. Frank H. Ballard, M.A.

It is not impossible that this article is due in the first place to an old grudge and to the subconscious workings of an inferiority complex. By birth and early training I belong to the country. I was born in a hamlet that could not boast even a parish church. To-day there are motors racing along the main road and buses tempting one into the towns where the shops set forth the latest fashions. Then there were only occasional traps and carriages and carriers' vans, some of which crawled at a round six miles an hour. Yet though truly rural we were less than five miles from a main line station from which Paddington could be reached in three-quarters of an hour. This meant that tired Londoners came to stay with us and brought the gay metropolis to our rustic doors. They were glad enough to come and reluctant to leave, but the air of condescension that surrounded them is never to be forgotten. If they went to a village shop to buy some groceries it was with a playful jest on their lips about the local Selfridge's. If they went to a village concert there would be ribald laughter about someone's rendering of a popular song or the inevitable pianoforte duet with which the programme began. They would put their scented handkerchiefs to their nostrils as they passed a pig-sty, and complain about the mud that soiled their silly little shoes. Some of them who stayed over week-ends thought it polite to go with us to the one place of worship within easy reach, but they were not always appreciative of the exhortations of the local preacher or the splendid lungs of the very mixed choir. We did not need to be told that it was not city standard. But we knew also that London was not all West End, that there were shoeless urchins in sordid slums, that there was a Cockney accent which was as remote from university type as ours with our unending vowels, that there were squalid little shops as well as great stores, and vulgar little entertainment places as well as Albert Halls, and crude mission rooms as well as Westminster Abbeys. But all these anomalies had vanished from the minds of our City cousins, who never allowed us to forget that they came from London, the centre of trade and government and finance—from London which was not merely the capital of the country but the hub of the universe. "London", they would say, "draws to itself sooner or later all the talent and genius. It has drawn us. It is even possible, if you are a good boy and work hard and follow our advice, it may draw you".

But the old grudge would not have lingered all this time were it not for a particular cast of mind. There is the mind that loves the crowd, that is exhilarated when masses of humans struggle for a

train, that finds fascination in roofs and endless streets of monotonous houses, though whether the fascination arises from the different sizes of aspidistras in the parlour window or the variety of paints on the front doors I have never been able to discover. There is also the mind that loves space and solitude, that works most vigorously where things grow and the seasons are allowed to spread their beauty without let or hindrance, where the stars are seen as stars and not as inferior street illuminations, where the sunset and the rainbow and the harvest moon and the frost on the trees have undisputed sway, and the nightingale tempts one out of doors on June evenings.

Charles Lamb's own preferences remind us that the city mind need not be a vulgar mind. "For my own part", he said,

> I have no hesitation in declaring that a mob of happy faces crowding up at the pit door of Drury Lane Theatre, just at the hour of six, gives me ten thousand sincerer pleasures than I could ever receive from all the flocks of silly sheep that ever whitened the plains of Arcadia or Epsom Downs.

He goes on to say that "the man must have a rare recipë for melancholy, who can be dull in Fleet Street", and that even the deformities of London do not displease him.

> Often, when I have felt a weariness or distaste at home have I rushed out into her crowded Strand and fed my humour, till tears have wetted my cheek for inutterable sympathies with the multitudinous moving pictures, which she never fails to present at all hours, like the scenes of a shifting pantomime.

Dr. Johnson was still more emphatic. Boswell having expressed a doubt about living in London, thinking that the exquisite zest of an occasional visit might fade and he might grow tired of it, Dr. Johnson replied in his downright manner:

> Why, Sir, you find no man, at all intellectual, who is willing to leave London. No, Sir, when a man is tired of London, he is tired of life; for there is in London all that life can afford.

That was *his* London: whether he would have said the same of our London, and especially of London's suburbs, is an open question.

The controversy of town and country is an old one and a perpetual one. Wherever you turn you find it, and doubtless it will still be a matter of debate when Macaulay's "traveller from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's". Not everyone is as positive and consistent as the Rechabites who figure in Old Testament history. The Rechabites were the anti-men of their times, abstaining not only from wine, but from most of the things civilized people desire—including towns and all the luxuries of towns. The poets are far less thorough, but from Virgil down to W. H. Davies they are nearly all inclined to believe that God made the country, man made the town. W. H. Davies's own experiences of towns were

almost uniformly unpleasant: now and again he might be found loitering in a public park or studying in a public library, but the streets he knew best were those where children played freely, but not well-fed, healthy, cared-for children such as the prophet saw in his vision of the future. His poems tell their own tale—as for example the one called "In the Country".

> This life is sweetest; in this wood
> I hear no children cry for food;
> I see no women, white with care;
> No man, with muscles wasting there.

He strikes another note in the one entitled "A Strange City", but he is still writing out of what he knows and has felt.

> Aye, solitude, black solitude indeed,
> To meet a million souls and know not one;

On the same side are many of the sociologists. One, an American, says that great cities, when they exceed 100,000 in population, are a menace, and when they exceed 1,000,000 are a crime; and he goes on to speak of the things that happen in modern cities—

> subdivision of labour and specialization which degrade men to the level of machines; concentration and segregation of industries, the factory system, high finance, and international finance, capitalism, and the international standardized education; metropolitan newspapers, pragmatic philosophy, and churches "run on business methods" and recruited by advertising and "publicity agents".

That is a good mouthful and it is well that we should take a deep breath before coming to the climax, which deals with

> the social poison that affects society with pernicious anæmia through cutting man off from his natural social group and making him an indistinguishable particle in a sliding stream of grain.

This writer (R. A. Cram) is dealing with another subject, and mine comes in only incidentally, but he lacks nothing in thoroughness in pointing out that man belongs not only to his family but to his neighbourhood and ought to have local interests, and the herding of multitudes together kills local patriotism. Men may laugh at the politics of the village pump, as I did when I read recently a delightful skit on a Devonshire attempt to run a parish council; but the congregating of vast crowds at Highbury or Chelsea, and knowledge of goal averages, together with some petty speculation on league positions, is a poor substitute for an attempt to order the life of a rural community.

It may be said that such Greek thinkers as Plato and Aristotle were on the side of the city-state. But they had never dreamed of anything like London or New York or Bombay or even Bristol or Edinburgh. My chief complaint about London is that it is too big—many, many

times too big. I am glad to know that even responsible persons have come to this conclusion and that legislation is likely to be attempted to hinder the sucking of the life of the country to one centre. Something has already been done to provide a green belt. We may expect other endeavours to prevent new factories being opened in the metropolitan area. I am not sanguine about success. This is no new discovery. As far back as the reign of Elizabeth the Lord Mayor and Aldermen were complaining

> of the vast increase of new buildings and number of inhabitants within the city and suburbs of London, chiefly occasioned by the great resort of people from all parts of the Kingdom to settle here.

James I issued many proclamations about London, and nine of them were attempts to check its growth. Charles I followed his father's example in this as in some other matters; Cromwell tried to act with the strictness that became a dictator; and Charles II thought he might succeed where better men had failed. They forbade overcrowding, the sub-letting and the dividing up of buildings. They forbade rebuilding on old foundations except in brick or stone. They forbade all new buildings within a given distance of the gates of London. The distance varied from one to five miles. The Commonwealth Act of Parliament made it ten miles, and imposed a fine on every building which had been erected on new foundations within that vast area during the previous 36 years, unless it had four acres round it. It is interesting to go back and read not only about Acts and Proclamations but the reasons that prompted them. They were afraid that the rest of the country would be impoverished (London then contained about 1/10th of the population: to-day it contains more than 1/5th). They were afraid they would not be able to find all the necessary water and food and fuel. Most of all—and in days of wooden houses and primitive sanitation they were not unfounded fears—they were afraid of fire and plague. But neither fears nor fines could stop the growth.

> One man built on the King's own ground, close to the King's own house. He even quarried his stone from the ancient foundations of that house. He was reproved but he went on. He completed his buildings and paid his fine.

Our own fears are partly the same, but mainly different. A vast capital and a sparsely populated country-side ought to make every patriot anxious, and that from a dozen different points of view. From the point of view of defence it is enough to say that ours is the most exposed capital in the world. It has been suggested that the seat of government ought to be moved further inland. Whether much would be attained may be doubted: it is a matter for the experts anyway. From the point of view of health much has been done, but things said recently about the smoke nuisance and especially about the household

fire show that much remains to be done. The chances are that before we are much older we shall not be allowed to toast our toes at an ordinary open grate unless we live in one of the rural areas. That, too, is for the scientist and the expert first and for the statesman afterwards. My training and interests make me think of other things.

I am very concerned about the way children are divorced from Nature. They may have better schools with free milk and medical attendance; they may get sharp minds through attending cinemas and reading sensational papers, but divorced from Nature they are divorced from a gracious nurse and are much to be pitied. Take such a subject as sex. Somehow they will get to know about their bodies and how life is reproduced, but how? Some may get fitting instruction in schools with the way unconsciously prepared in elementary science. A fortunate few may get knowledge from wise parents. Many will get it in most undesirable ways and with harmful results. My contention is that no way can be as good as the way the country-child learns. He learns from the life that is around him —from birds whose nests he seeks and finds, from pets whose puppies and kittens he fondles, from breeding on the farm, from fishes and insects. It is all there before his eyes without shame or secrecy from babyhood. The normal country child knows before he understands and therefore understands without any violent shock. I have sympathy up to a point with the endeavours of earnest people who have solemn conferences on how to teach the young "the facts of life", but it all seems fatally artificial to one born and bred in the country.

Or take another great subject—religious instruction. We have lately heard much about William Tyndale and his great work in getting the Bible into the homes and hearts of the English people. We have also been encouraged by statistics showing that there is still a great demand from almost all over the world for the Old Book. But in our own cities hundreds of thousands of young people are growing up without any knowledge of either Testament. A teacher told me recently that in Scripture a certain class was reading the trial and death of Jesus and some of them had become so interested that they did not want to break off for the day. "Tell us", said one of the children, "did he get off?"

This abysmal ignorance has many causes: one is this, that the Bible is in the main steeped in Nature and the town child knows next to nothing about Nature. The 23rd Psalm with its picture of the shepherd leading his sheep, providing food, beating off wild beasts—the country child is near enough to the scene to understand a much more primitive civilization where the rod was as necessary as the staff. But your city child needs the imagery of a machine age with references to electric power and trolley buses and tram conductors. The same is true of hymns. The great favourites in the past have been full of moor and fen, crag and torrent, and

secret places of the heart have been touched. But what do boys and girls whose days are bounded by brick and mortar and shop windows and street lamps know or care about fens and crags? They may hardly know the meaning of the words. They need hymns about "whirring wheels" and dynamos and street signals. But it is difficult to write good verses about machinery. The urban poet of the new mechanics may some day appear: the signs of his appearing are hard to find.

Take another subject: the maintenance of peace, especially international peace. All men of goodwill and ordinary sanity are straining every nerve to keep the guns from going off. But the difficulties are far greater with densely packed urban populations than with scattered rural ones. Dr. J. Holland Rose in his *Development of European Nations* says that it was public opinion which forced the French Government to draw the sword against Germany in 1870, but it was the public opinion of Paris, not of France as a whole. He says:

> The massing of mankind in great cities, where thought is superficial and feelings can quickly be stirred by a sensation-mongering Press, has undoubtedly helped to feed public passions and national hatred. A rural population is not deeply stirred by stories of slights to ambassadors. The peasant of Brittany had no active dislike for the peasant of Brandenburg. Each only asked to be left to till his fields in peace and safety. But the crowds on the Parisian boulevards and in *Unter den Linden* took (and seemingly always will take) a very different view of life. To them the news of the humiliation of the rival beyond the Rhine was the greatest and therefore the most welcome of sensations; and, unfortunately, the papers which pandered to their habits set the tone of thought for no small part of France and Germany, and exerted on national policy an influence out of all proportion to its real weight.

If I were a dictator I would allow no houses to be built with less than a quarter-acre of garden, and force the family (unless good reason for exemption could be given) to work it themselves. This might do more than all the peace meetings and conferences to save us from war. I would also impose a censorship on the wireless and on newspapers. My dictatorship would mean the curtailment of personal liberty beyond my natural inclinations, but I should curtail the liberty of my children to play with fire, so why should we not curtail the liberty of adults who refuse to grow up when they play with much more inflammable material than the domestic hearth? I might even consider the advisability of prohibiting mass meetings. All these gettings-together with their loud speeches and appeals to passion ought to be regarded by peace-lovers with great suspicion. And perhaps one of these days we shall conclude that science with its loud-speakers and amplifiers and wireless and printing presses and

inducements to herding, as well as with its bombs and gas and submarines and aeroplanes, is the great enemy of humanity. These accompaniments are dangerous toys for immature nations.

But my chief objection to great cities, and to London in particular as the greatest of cities, is that they stifle individuality and belittle men. It is not the environment for greatness of mind or character, but for mediocrity. It may make man quick and clever but not deep and strong. Is that not why so few leaders of thought or action arise in crowded areas? Many years ago statistics gathered in the city of Boston revealed the fact that some eighty per cent of the leaders of Christian work were born and reared in the country. It would be interesting to get up-to-date statistics from some English city. But why limit the enquiry to Christian work? Why not go to politics and scholarships, to the law and poetry? How many Prime Ministers has London produced in the last century? How many Lord Chancellors or Poets-Laureate or Archbishops? Remember that London contains more than one-fifth of the entire population of the country, and then think how many come from remote villages or provincial towns and how few from the metropolis itself. It is not surprising. London kills initiative and robs a man of independence of mind. The small community drags out of a man whatever good there is in him. I paid a visit to a little town in Suffolk not long ago and stayed with a young man of ordinary gifts. Yet his father had been Mayor of the town: he himself was on the town council and innumerable committees as well as being deacon and secretary of a Free Church. In using his gifts he had developed them and filled his life with interest and usefulness. He told me how he came to a London suburb to spend a week-end with a friend and his wife. They lived in a smart little suburban house, but they had no friends, no duties, no interests beyond the theatre and the cinema. They were bored, and he was so bored that he was glad to retreat to the manifold interests of the little Suffolk town.

That conversation reminded me of Angus McNeill's satirical book *The Egregious English,* now probably forgotten. T. W. H. Crosland had had the temerity to write *The Unspeakable Scot,* and McNeill replied with a few home truths and much imagination. The chapter on Suburbia ought to be reprinted by an enterprising publisher. A few details are out of date but in the main it is a useful picture, with a touch of caricature, to make us see how others see us.

The Hampstead Garden Suburb was a daring attempt to get away from all that. Dame Henrietta Barnett and her helpers threw down a challenge to builders and they left us with houses that are picturesque if not always convenient, with at least reminders of village greens and community life. They set themselves to encourage neighbourliness and to discourage snobbery. Even gardens were to be semi-public, and an institute was provided in which we might

help to educate one another. For years the experiment succeeded. The residents lived together, so I am told, as neighbours and friends. There was a spirit of co-operation, even in religion, and there was some reason for the boast that in the Suburb one had all the advantages and none of the disadvantages of London life. The experiment is now breaking down. A permanent memorial to Dame Henrietta has been erected, but the best way to honour her will be to maintain the ideals she inculcated, and to endeavour to keep on the borders of the greatest city in the world the spirit of neighbourliness and co-operation, and to encourage other residential neighbourhoods to guard individuality and personality, as the pearl of great price.

We wish we could have listened in to the discussions between the Rev. Roger Lloyd, the author of *Revolutionary Religion* (S.C.M., 5s.) and his parishioners at Great Harwood, which he has recently left to become Canon of Winchester. We are thoroughly tired by now of books on Fascism and Communism, and Canon Lloyd's book bears many signs of haste (when names are incorrectly spelt, 24, 140, 192, we are inevitably constrained to wonder whether the writer is to be trusted in bigger things), but the book is worth while for its final pages, especially those which deal with the worship of the Church. In his survey of the totalitarian States Canon Lloyd says little that is new, but in these pages about worship he is at the heart of things. We wish, however, that he showed some awareness of the existence of other churches than the Anglican. In the discussion of the work of the Church we are suddenly plunged into "for good or ill, the Church of England is parochial". There seems to be no conception of the whole Church of Christ in a parish as a mighty army. We get instead:

> The vicar and Church people of a slum parish, acting together, must plainly attack, and alleviate if they can, the wretched housing conditions of his people, and the richer parish must help them.

Why not all Christian people rather than the vicar and Church people? Here is a pregnant sentence:

> The primary difference between the Christian and the follower of any other revolutionary path . . . is that the Christian knows that he is a fellow-worker with God.

DIVINE GUIDANCE: A PURPOSIVE CRITICISM.

By the Rev. Leslie J. Belton, B.A., M.Sc.

I.

"Seeming trivialities are not overlooked by the Holy Spirit", says a writer on the Group Movement. After reading some of their literature we are inclined to agree. But what strikes the observer of the Groups most forcibly (their earnestness one can take for granted) is their familiarity with the Holy Spirit. "God is our Pilot", continues the same writer; "we cannot expect God to talk to us if we do not talk to Him". In the idiom of the Group, God impresses His counsel on the minds of those who seek His direction and wait, notebook in hand, to record their God-given thoughts.

The procedure has obvious dangers. By what means is the Grouper to distinguish between a God-given thought and an unconscious wish? On what rational grounds is it assumed that some of the promptings rising into the focus of consciousness come from God and others from the carnal recesses of the subconscious mind? In other words, how does the recipient distinguish between the voice of the Holy Spirit and the no less insistent voice of his hidden desires? These are teasing questions, and it is not a fair answer for the Grouper to contend that in cases of doubt he can "check-up" with the teachings of the Bible (the Bible being conveniently used as a modern oracle) or seek the more detached verdict of his fellow-believers. These objective tests may sometimes save him (so, too, may commonsense) from the worst pitfalls of subjectivism, but the history of religion clearly reveals how prone are the devout of all ages to assume the inerrancy of their own monitions and to discover in external "checks" exactly the verification they wish to find. In practice, immediacy often becomes its own test. Thus, any idea arising in the mind, especially when it declares itself *con animo,* vividly and with animation, may be accepted as divine, if it accords with morality and commonsense—and sometimes if it does not. Rationalization follows in due course; the process of finding "reasons" for making the Holy Ghost the sponsor of an eminently acceptable idea is only too easily learned. Although the believer may occasionally feel moved to pursue a line of action which conflicts with his conscious inclination, if this line of action leads, either for himself or for others, to some desirable end, then manifestly here also he may trace the hand of God. His carnal will has been overruled!

II.

The assumption that God directs the affairs of His chosen people is as old as Moses. The Group Movement has but revived and

popularized a belief and a practice which can be traced back to ancient times. Every theistic religion allows of communication between the adorer and the adored, and the practice of prayer assumes it. Even so, a distinction can be drawn between the assumption of God's (or the gods') accessibility, and the practice of guidance. It is one thing to believe that prayers are answered because the Divine Will can manipulate events; it is another thing to believe that God speaks directly to the human soul, and not to privileged mortals only but to everyone capable of hearing His voice. Thus, according to the Protestant's assumption, not only the priest and the prophet (and sometimes the oracle) are the mouthpieces of God but every believer who disposes his heart aright.

In the fourteenth century, the author of the *Theologica Germanica* wrote of the inward illumination of the "Divine Light", and, likewise, Ruysbroeck (1293-1381) maintained that "every spirit . . . has a manner more or less profound of seeking God in its own depths". These mystical thinkers were not alone in emphasizing the idea of a confluence of the human and the divine. But they had to reckon with the Church. The institutional Church looked with disfavour upon such "presumptuous" claims, for they conflicted with her privileged office of dispenser of heavenly grace through the sacraments. But with the Reformation revolt against the absolute supremacy of the Church over the souls of men, the Christian, becoming his own priest, became also, in virtue of his priesthood, a potential mystic. In the words of Charles Beard, Christianity became, in theory, if not in fact, "a personal thing, a power within the soul, placing it in direct relation with God".

This new insight into the essentially personal relationship of the individual soul with its Divine source, was, indeed, the master-idea of the Protestant revolt, and no theological doctrinarianism could wholly occlude it. It is seen in Hans Denck (1495-1527). Following in the shadow of Tauler and the Friends of God, Denck testified to the "Inner Word", the Spirit in every man. That man "is really justified", said Denck, "in whose heart the law has been written by the Holy Spirit". So, too, a century later, Gerrard Winstanley could confess:

> I looked for a God without me, but *now* the true worshipper knows who God is and how he is to be worshipped as the Spirit and Power of Light shining within the man himself.

George Fox's valiant testimony to the Inner Light is still the inspiration of many thousands of Christian people. But it remained for James Martineau to justify the doctrine of intuitionism in intellectual and ethical terms. In *The Seat of Authority in Religion* (1890) he wrote (thus bridging the gulf, fixed in the eighteenth century, between religion, natural and revealed):

> Revealed religion is an immediate divine knowledge, it is

> strictly personal and individual, and must be born anew in every mind. It admits of no condition separating the Self-revealer from the recipient soul.

By the beginning of the present century Dr. Inge, in well-known words, could triumphantly affirm that the centre of gravity in religion had shifted from authority to experience.

The post-war years, it is true, have shown distinct signs, notably on the Continent, of a swing-back from the mystico-subjective to the transcendental-authoritarian emphasis in theology, disallowing any community of nature between God in His absolute Sovereignty and the human spirit: "God is in Heaven and man on earth", exclaims Barth. But a purely defeatist theology, which discredits man and belittles his sublimest insights, is no more likely to satisfy the deepest human needs than its logical opposite, belief in man's inevitable perfection within the natural order, was able to do. On no terms can Deism, whatever form it takes, either justify or render comprehensible that profoundest mystical insight which sees Life infinitely extending through all its multifarious manifestations, binding all living forms in one; so that, as Tyrrell expressed it,

> from the luminousness of our personal experience, to the twilight and darkness of universal experience, we come to see that the whole lives in us, and that in it we live and move and have our being.

Whether it take the lofty form of mystic insight or the questionable form of instructional guidance, intuitionism demands for its operation an immanental basis and field.

III.

It is against this background that we must judge and validate, if we can, the doctrine of divine guidance. Unless we can assume some measure of confluence between the human and the divine; unless we can maintain the immanentist view against the deistical conception of a Divine Being operating upon the world *ab extra*, we are obliged either to deny altogether the possibility of experiential guidance, or to assume that, in some miraculous fashion, the Deity manipulates human affairs according to His own will or in response to prayer—an essay in anthropomorphism we are not prepared to make. It follows, then, that we must either reject the evidence for direct guidance; or, accepting it, we must assume: (1) That the Divine Guider operates *through* human beings under the conditions of "natural law" and in concordance with the theological doctrine of the Holy Spirit ("Men spake from God being moved by the Holy Spirit". *2 Pet.* 1[21]), or (2) That the experience usually interpreted as divine guidance is in fact a psychological process which, though as yet inexplicable, will eventually be explained on purely naturalistic lines. In the latter alternative, it is not the *experience* of guidance

which is denied, but the assumption that this experience is divinely inspired in any exceptional sense and to a degree that reasoned judgment is not so inspired.

It will be profitable to ask, does the evidence for divine guidance allow of our attributing the experience of guidance to some extra-human source? Or is this experience no more divine than the acts of breathing and of thinking may be said to be?

When the Protestant-Christian comes to answer the question "How does God speak?", he is logically driven to reply, "God speaks in the conscience and reason of man". Or, as George Fox rather quaintly expressed it:

> The Lord shewed me . . . that He did not dwell in these temples which men had commanded and set up, but in people's hearts; for both Stephen and the apostle Paul bore testimony that He did not dwell in temples made with hands . . . ; but that His people were His temple, and He dwelt in them.

How unquestioning was Fox's reliance upon his inner monitor and guide, and how unfaltering was his obedience to its commands is seen on almost every page of his Journal. But it is of greater significance that Fox's inner guide (thanks to his rich fund of common-sense) seems to have preserved him from fanatical excess. Like John Woolman, Fox is singularly free from the extravagance to which those who rely on the immediate "leading" of God are so often and so disastrously prone.

If a measure of mental balance and commonsense saved Fox from excess, the same can scarcely be said of some of his kinsmen in the faith who preceded or followed him. Thomas Schucker, a Swiss Anabaptist, after declaring in solemn assembly, "I will do nothing but what is revealed to me by our heavenly father", drew his sword and cut off his brother's head. That was in the sixteenth century, but modern history records instances which, though less gruesome, are no less astonishing in their testimony to the fanaticism of which human nature is capable once egotism is reinforced by missionary zeal. If the doctrine of the Inner Light can beatify, it can also degrade; if it can ennoble human character, it can also occasionally betray it into noisome alleyways of self-deceit. Whether it does one or the other largely depends upon the insight and poise of the individual believer. Where insight and intellectual poise are lacking, we get a Henry James Prince, a Smyth-Piggott, a Joanna Southcott, and the religious fanatics of whom Ray Strachey tells in her study of American cults (*Religious Fanaticism*, London, 1928). Even saintly James Nayler submitted, all too passively, to the divine honours his credulous followers thrust upon him—and suffered cruelly for his lapse. The step is but a short one from a sane admission of divine guidance (as among modern Quakers) to an insane pretence of divine favour, from calm reliance on the Divine

Will to a presumption of the Almighty's especial concern with one's personal affairs, as witness that popular preacher, William Huntingdon (1745-1813), whose magniloquent egotism could express itself thus:

> The condescension of my dear Redeemer was so great to His unworthy servant that He communed with me all the day long. If a doubt or a scruple arose in my mind He answered my thoughts by His Word; if I felt a burden, when I called He took it off . . . ; if I met with a difficult passage of scripture, He would send me two or three other passages as keys to unlock it and sweetly to lead me into the soul-establishing meaning of it[1].

Reading these words, one can sympathize, if one cannot wholeheartedly agree, with Bishop Butler when he said—as was only seemly in an eighteenth century divine—that "to pretend to particular gifts of the Holy Spirit" appeared to him to be "a very horrid thing"! It does become, spiritually, psychologically, and socially, "a horrid thing" when belief in divine guidance is conjoined, as it was in Huntingdon, with a powerful ego-impulse. When this occurs, the plea of divine guidance can be made covertly to justify the most aberrant human behaviour and the craziest of beliefs—and there is no prophet who lacks some credulous disciples. For, as Mr. Aldous Huxley has reminded us, "There is no dogma so queer, no behaviour so eccentric or even outrageous, but a group of people can be found to think it divinely inspired". The history of religious extravagance is the best advocate the sceptic can produce.

IV.

But if the doctrine of divine guidance is to be justly assessed, we have to note its effects, not only upon its dramatically abnormal representatives, but also upon such humbler believers as may be found among the sects, and notably among the Ranters and the modern Buchmanites. Here also we find (almost to our sorrow we acknowledge it) that the experient of divine guidance often reveals a state of mind bordering on the psychopathic. Sometimes, however, the result—harmless enough, perhaps—is simply ludicrous, as in Mr. A. J. Russell's journalistic account of his own experience, in *For Sinners Only*.

> There seemed to be a faint electrical crackling in the air about me. I felt a message impinge on my brain from the air. It alighted softly like the caress of a leaf at the touch of a gentle zephyr. It was accompanied by a sense of exaltation both pleasurable and unforgettable.

This "electro-magnetic" Paraclete is at least up to date!

Referring to her own experience of guidance among the Quakers of New England, Hannah Whitall Smith tells us[2] that so proud was

[1] L. Wyatt Lang, *Christ's Psychology of the Kingdom*, 81.
[2] Ray Strachey, *Religious Fanaticism*, Chapter X.

a certain Quaker of her new drawing-room carpet that in order to mortify her pride she determined (felt "led") "to have a load of stones and mud wheeled in and upset upon it". To what extent Heaven can be said to enter into this sort of transaction is best shown by quoting Hannah Smith's considered judgment:

> I have come to the conclusion that divine guidance is one of the most contagious things in the religious life, and that you are almost sure to catch the same sort of guidance as the people with whom you associate.

It is possible that we have in these words a clue to the partial understanding of at least one of the forms which the practice of guidance may take.

Emotion has remarkable carrying-power, and the evidence goes to show that actual bodily proximity is by no means necessary for affectively-charged ideas to spread "miraculously" from person to person. What is true of the "crowd" is to some extent also true of the "group" when its members are bound together by some common emotional bond. (And truer than we commonly realize of Society at large.) Thus, people who are closely associated with one another become sensitive to the same emotional (telepathic?) charge. Its impact on themselves, rising into consciousness with compulsive force, is interpreted as the voice of God (guidance), if such an interpretation accords with the pattern of their ideas. With how much greater frequency and intensity will this occur if such monitions are cultivated and desired? Many of the impulses which pass for divine guidance might reasonably be explained on these lines; what seems like a heaven-sent miracle is in fact a natural psychical process, as yet but little understood. If the believer in divine guidance retorts, as he may; "Of course, but God achieves his purpose by natural not by supernatural means, and what you call telepathy may be one of the means he adopts", we can but graciously reply, "It may be so".

But a difficulty emerges. It so happens that not only the faithful, the worthy, and the devout are "guided", but the unfaithful, the unworthy and the profane also. Not those only who believe their "leadings" come from God but those who do not so believe (and consequently heed them less) are the subjects of this psychological process. As the rain falls on the just and the unjust alike, so do these promptings well up, with equal indiscrimination, in mortal mind. No group has a monopoly of guidance. If guidance is more in evidence in one group than among other equally estimable people, that is simply because the technique of guidance is actively fostered among them, because its members are admonished to "catch hold" of impulses which other people who are not so admonished ignore or too lightly let go. We doubt whether the conclusion can be avoided that *what customarily passes in certain circles for divine guidance is a psychological experience which, as such, has no more (and no less)*

spiritual value than the more deliberate and prosaic processes of ratiocinative thought.

V.

Reason is the final arbiter. Faced with the question, "How do you know that what you feel is a God-given thought is in reality what you believe it to be and not an impulse of your own deeper mind masquerading as a divine command?", the believer in guidance is forced into one of two positions. Either (1) He must accept his monition, act on it, and take the risk of its being less august than he supposes it to be (in which case he will proceed on the *als ob* assumption, little though he realizes the nature of his procedure), or (2) He must submit his monition, as he interprets it, to some other person or persons to pronounce upon, and then accept their judgment as to its source and infallibility. Alternatively, he may reason things out for himself as best he can, in which case the verdict will wholly depend upon the degree of detachment he can assume over against his own wish-to-believe. When, however, one is, at one and the same time, both the interested party *and* the arbiter, a dispassionate judgment is never easy to reach. Only through rational deliberation can it be reached at all. Reason is the final test. Guidance, therefore, has to submit to a higher control. Is "divinity" less evident in the exercise of this higher control than in the spontaneous declaration of an impulse from within? That is the crucial question. Reason answers "No!"

One final point emerges. What has here been said in adverse criticism of the doctrine of divine guidance applied to the affairs of every-day life is not designed to invalidate the affirmation (common to both Eastern and Western religions in different forms) of divine immanence in humanity. That, indeed, is an affirmation this essay assumes. Nor do we wish to imply that human experience at its best is governed by rational consideration alone, intuition having no rightful and imperative place in human behaviour and thought. On the contrary, we hold that intuitional judgments (though subject to the test of Reason) have their incontestable and necessary place in the experience of every awakened soul. Through intuition we *recognize* goodness, beauty, and truth. Intuition, "the extension of perception to regions beyond sense", as Professor Radakrishnan describes it, is the truest inward monitor and guide, the token in normal human experience of an Innermost Self, the centre of eternal rectitude and abiding truth. It is to affirm the grandeur of this mystic conception to which the seers of all ages have testified, and to rescue it from confusion with a psychological phenomenon which too easily degrades and cheapens it, that this article is written.

THE SERMON NEEDED TO-DAY.

By the Rev. Binney Simpson Black.

Among the things which have served to keep religion alive throughout the centuries is the Christian pulpit, the preaching of the Christian Gospel. Since the age of the Apostles the preached word has been the chief means of interpreting and propagating the faith, of quickening the conscience, kindling the affections, and calling men engrossed in material interests and aims to the vision of the higher and eternal things. The Christian pulpit has been the shaping force of enduring civilization, a witness for the living Christ, who is the hope of mankind. Great is the power of the press, the power of the politician, and the power of money, but they do not compare with the power of a live fearless pulpit that is consecrated to God and the highest interests of men. There are those to-day who say that "the pulpit is losing its power", and they question greatly the place and value the sermon has had in most Protestant churches. But it must be acknowledged that preaching is the only opportunity many busy people have to know what religion is, and that right across the centuries to this our own day, preaching has been the fashion, and religious revival and world reform have followed in its wake.

But what kind of sermon is needed to-day? Truly a staggering question! The only man who should at all venture to tackle it is a man who is much dissatisfied with his own preaching, and yet has a growing interest and enthusiasm in the preacher's task and what Silvester Horne denominated "The Romance of Preaching", our "high calling" with its "perennial fascination and glory". Let us try if possible to see daylight through it.

The kind of sermon *wanted* to-day is another question. In the regular Sunday assembly all classes are to be found, and each class has its preference for a certain type of discourse. The old man or woman wants an orthodox sermon; the young man, a lively sermon; the maiden, a beautiful sermon; the child, a simple sermon; the student, a logical sermon; the business man, a practical sermon; the bereaved, a comforting sermon. Those who criticize ministers and think they have an easy job had better stop and think of what a preacher is "up against" every time he faces his Sunday congregation. His task is herculean. The demands of his hearers are like the sands of the sea for multitude. In those pews before him are scattered fellow-beings representing the widest possible range of human needs and longings. There sits the aching-hearted mother whose prodigal son or daughter is she knows not where, and her face is a study with those wistful, searching eyes. There sits the father who is still out of work, with wife and children hungry and inadequately clad, and the bills are piling up without a cent to meet them. The young man

and woman just leaving the shelter of the home to accept business positions are there, and they are anxious. The eager questioner is there, disturbed in mind, all tangled up in a web of religious confusion, the product in part of this scientific age, and his whole spiritual life is threatened. What an eye he trains upon the preacher! In how many pews sit mourners, and they long to catch some word that will dry their tears. And there are those—a large class—who are weary of the ceaseless struggle with hard realities and can think of life only as a meaningless drudgery, with no great and holy end, but just a frantic effort to secure the food that perishes. What a picture of intolerable yearning and dire need is painted when the sons of men assemble in the house of the living God all over the habitable world.

What such persons need is a renewal of the eternal in their common life.

> 'Tis life whereof our nerves are scant,
> More life and fuller that we want.

In *This Ministry* Dr. W. B. Selbie tells us that "The first business of the pulpit is to arouse in men this sense of need, and then to show how it can be abundantly supplied in and through Jesus Christ". The work of the ministry, he affirms, is to present the Christian religion not merely as a rule of life but as life. But who and what is sufficient for these things? Where is the preacher, so truly a lover of folks and a lover of God, with such sympathy, and insight, and spiritual vision that he is able to minister to needs so diversified, bring out the hidden, unguessed goodness that is in them, and cast a white light over a dull and drab existence?

In order to attain the great end of preaching and help people to solve their practical problems, recourse is had to various types of sermons. These are known in the homiletic art as Textual, Expository, Topical, Evangelistic, and so forth. These sermonic styles have their strength and their weakness. Much is to be said for each of them. Topical preaching—so much in vogue in the United States—has a certain merit of uptodateness, with its discussion of current events, a passing shot at all and sundry that happens to be crossing the field of attention. A glance at the column of city churches recently in a Saturday morning newspaper gave the following topics for Sunday treatment: "If I were a Millionaire"; "Divorce"; "A Liberal Education"; "The Sins of Modernism"; "Some Things in the Bible I do not Believe"; as well as current politics. These were topical sermons, and may boast the advantage of contemporary interest. Instead of starting with a text and allowing the text to make its own suggestions, the topical preacher starts with his own ideas on some subject of his choice, a subject chosen very likely to fill the empty pews. For every preacher welcomes a crowd and knows

that many are attracted by an out-of-the-way topic, a smart announcement that rouses curiosity. There are in these days as in other days multitudes who have "itching ears" and become hangers-on at any church whose pulpit produces the sensation they are after. What they want is "something different", and they will listen to any dealer in sensations and stunts. There was a preacher in the city of Toronto years ago named Wild, a man who drew large crowds to the Bond Street Congregational Church. Here are two quite typical sermon subjects announced by him: "How to Eat Honey"; "When will the Last Child be Born?" I refrain from further samples lest conservative minds might require a stimulant. There are other "wild" men in the pulpits here and there who are handing ditch water to thirsty souls, instead of "the water of life" from the stream that is clear as crystal. The good people who extract consolation from such sermons are like the babies who are pacified with what are called comforters; they are getting more wind than milk. So much topical preaching attaches to the local and temporary, the fashion of which is passing away. It is not to be recommended for steady diet, though now and again for special occasions it may be handled with dignity and power.

What then of the *Expository* sermon? There are those who want it, and none who does not need it, and it must still be employed by every worthy exponent of the preaching art. As long as the name of F. W. Robertson is fresh and fragrant ministers will seek to model their discourses by that almost perfect example of the expository method, so fresh, so suggestive, so forceful, so Biblical. For such sermons teem with thought, and congregations that hear such sermons cannot help but grow in mental and spiritual stature. But the expository sermon is liable to lack in the element of up-to-dateness and direct contact with contemporary wants. Expository sermons regularly start with a passage of Scripture, and the preacher's chief concern so often is to do justice to that particular verse or verses, whether or not he does justice to the waiting congregation. To elucidate the meaning of the ancient writer, and to relate the text to its context—an historical exposition—may occupy a lot of time and be of very questionable value when the thing is done. Then but a few transient moments remain to annex some application to the people who are sitting in the pews. This kind of sermon has a wrong perspective; it begins at the wrong end and so gets nowhere. People are not interested in textual analysis *per se*, nor in ancient history as a thing detached from life. They are interested in their own day and their own lives primarily, and will give at once an attentive ear to the sermon which begins with some real problem in the lives of the auditors, states it clearly, deals with it frankly, kindly, and helpfully, and uses the Bible as a searchlight upon the shadowed spots and perplexing problems of men and women.

Some hearers are never satisfied with a sermon unless the preacher is on the war path with a "tread on the tail of my coat" attitude, determined to make short work of those doctrines and practices which are these persons' pet aversions. They want their minister to "go for" Russellism for all he is worth, or to have his fling at the Latter Day Saints, or dwell upon the Second Coming, or "dress down" the Modernists, or break a lance with the Roman Catholics, or put Socialism where it belongs, or "take a crack" at the Christian Scientists. I had in one of my churches a man of estimable character, a leading business man in the city, but he belonged to a narrow school of thought, and no sermon was a true sermon to him unless it contained the "substitutionary" theory of the Atonement, the substitution of a punished, innocent victim for the guilty sons of men. This particular theory had to be presented in its unadulterated form, and with constant repetition of such phrases as "the blood of Christ". Any other kind of sermon was only such a sermon, he would remark, "as any Unitarian minister might preach". "There is a fountain filled with blood" was the type of hymn he welcomed most. We often wondered whether this particular hearer ever really got behind his special theological theory about the Crucifixion, behind the exact Scripture terminology, so as to understand the real significance of all such New Testament phrases and to appreciate in any large way the deep, unfathomable, glorious mystery of the death of the Son of God, the full content of which no words can convey. Instead of thanking his minister for an honest attempt to infuse reality into familiar sounds and to avoid that "vain repetition" which is mockery, he thought him disloyal to Scripture truth. This man was but typical of a class to be found in many churches. These would-be sticklers for "sound doctrine" ought to know that there are many other subjects to be considered in the wide range of Christian thought, and many occasions on which the presentation of specific doctrines or theories is out of place. For, "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honorable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, *think on these things*".

Some of the adjectives we have used to describe the various kinds of sermons are a bit confusing. "Textual" or "topical"—who cares which? Scores of sermon tasters could not label them correctly. But there is an adjective used to describe a sermon, and multitudes have rolled it as a sweet morsel under their tongues. It is the adjective "orthodox". "Orthodox" is one of the most misunderstood and abused words in all the English language. What crimes have been committed in its name! What heartaches! What schisms! Orthodoxy is very apt to be my belief, and heterodoxy every other man's belief. Orthodoxy has been taken to mean a firm

grasp of the great truths and principles which lie at the foundation of the Gospel. An "orthodox" sermon is one that is sound in religious opinions or doctrines as judged by the Bible, the Creed, the Catechism, and such like Standards of the Faith. But the standards of orthodoxy have changed in some respects with the passage of time, so that the orthodox sermon of to-day does not coincide at every point with the orthodox sermon of yesterday. To-day we bring every doctrine and every practice to the touchstone of the spirit and teachings of Jesus and in that light of lights we accept or reject the doctrines of a former time. To-day the question is not so much "Is it orthodox?" as "Is it true?"

The sermons of years ago were often offensively dogmatic about the programme for the world to come. No less a preacher than C. H. Spurgeon has left on record a sermon of his in which he declared that sinners would be "roasted in literal fire", plunged now and then into "a vessel of hot oil", with "every nerve a string on which the devil shall ever play his diabolical tune of hell's unutterable lament". Such a picture, we believe, is the painting of unlicensed imagination or crude mythology, utterly inhuman, unethical, and dogmatic. But this view was popular enough in that great preacher's day, and, with some refinements of conception perhaps, it was the orthodox idea. The same kind of sermon was preached in an earlier day in New England. Jonathan Edwards, the greatest among early American theologians, preached the "fire and brimstone" doctrine of hell, and it found an echo in every orthodox pulpit of his time. Such orthodoxy makes us shudder and such sermons in our time would drive the thoughtful into unbelief. Of course we believe in heaven and hell as truly as men ever did. The fact of retribution still stands and, as W. E. Barton put it, "If there is no hell, it is time one was established". But while we have got rid of the belief in a material place of torment similar to that pictured by Dante, we believe, as Jesus clearly taught, in the existence of a hell as real as any picture of Dante's and as terrible as any setting forth of the doctrine that has been a nightmare to the minds of men. There is no erasing from the Bible the fact of retribution, and it ought to be current coin in the preaching of our day. It will never do to empty out the baby with the bath water and renounce the doctrine altogether. But the orthodox sermon on this subject should be no less powerful in its appeal because it is more reasonable, less harsh, and more in harmony with the real truth of the Bible.

The "modern mind" so-called has revolted against certain gross extravagances and the unreality of some of the doctrines that used to be the meat and drink of the preachers of an earlier day. Sermons on the Sovereignty of God were popular in many quarters. We still believe in the Divine Sovereignty, but an earlier day presented it differently. And the revolt against the orthodox presentation of that

day comes out in a certain Sam Lawson's comment on preaching, as recorded by an American writer some years ago:

> Wal, Parson Simpson's a smart man; but I tell you, it's kind o' discouragin'. Why, he said our state and condition by nature was just like this. We was clear down in a well fifty feet deep, and all the sides round nothin' but glare ice; and we was under immediate obligations to get out, 'cause we was free, voluntary agents. But nobody ever had got out, and nobody would unless the Lord reached down and took 'em. And whether He would or not nobody could tell; it was all Sovereignty. He said there wasn't one in a hundred—not one in ten thousand—that would be saved. Says I to myself, if that's so, they're any of 'em welcome to my chance. And so I kind o' ris up and come out.

This is what the "modern mind" has done, "kind o' ris up and come out" from an atmosphere of theological gloom and unreality into one of clearer light and greater Scriptural truthfulness where a man could breathe and live. Earlier sermons affirmed that God had elected from all eternity those who were to be saved, and that they alone would be won by sovereign grace to eternal life. There is a great truth in "election", but we must not hold it in such hard and fantastic forms as reduce it to cold fatalism and make it war against the spirit and teachings of the Master. Not a limited atonement, but a Father who is "unwilling that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance". The modern orthodoxy thinks of God in terms not only of Sovereignty but of Fatherhood.

The orthodox sermon of an earlier day held to what is called the plenary or verbal inspiration theory of the Bible. Every statement in the Bible is accurate; every word, every letter, jot, and tittle of every book is equally inspired; every statement historical, scientific, religious, is literally and exactly true, and that for all time. Anything in the Bible must not be questioned. There are no discrepancies, no contradictions, and every last syllable is the very word of God, ready-made, infallibly true, and absolutely authoritative. This was the orthodox view of Scripture (as it still is in some quarters). But there has been a radical departure from this view of Inspiration. Yet the *modern* orthodox sermon stands foursquare for the inspiration and unique authority of the Bible, claiming it to be "infallible" in this sense, that it leads men infallibly to God, and any humble seeking soul can find in the Bible, over against all rival schemes and systems, a sure and safe rule of faith and practice.

About four centuries ago a sermon was orthodox if it happened to be on the passage, "The earth is established that it cannot be moved", and maintained the Ptolemaic astronomy, an earth-centred universe, that the earth was flat, and that the sun and moon and stars were only lamps swinging round it every day. To have breathed a

suggestion of the Copernican astronomy would have been an outrage and a sin of sins. So much was this the case that the ecclesiastical leaders would have none of this nonsense, and the Inquisition condemned Copernicus's theories. Galileo proved later that Copernicus was right, whereupon Galileo was condemned for saying that the Bible was only a moral guide and not a scientific authority. But the "orthodox" preacher of to-day knows that science has brought vast changes, and he holds that there is no need of laboured reconciliation between the Bible and the science of our day. A book intended for all the ages could not possibly anticipate scientific discovery, and we should no more expect accurate astronomy or geology in the Bible than accurate chemistry and accurate anatomy.

Yes, a very marked change in thought and belief is apparent to any who will take a bird's-eye view over the stretches of time. We are approximating ever nearer to the real truth of things. Before the Christ appeared, emotions and actions were attributed to God such as no one could ascribe to Him who knows the God of Jesus. Jesus has changed our thinking about God. The content of orthodoxy has changed in some important respects as time has passed. We still ask for an "orthodox" sermon, but by orthodox (*orthos*, right, and *doxa*, opinion) we mean true, sound, in accordance with the truth "as truth is in Jesus", as expounded and illustrated and illumined by the Master Teacher who said, "I am the Truth".

One type of sermon is generally condemned. It is called the Sensational Sermon. When the nature of the sensation is properly understood, I confess to a strong attachment to this sermon. In fact, I have come to the conviction after hearing sermons and reading sermonic literature ever since I was a boy, that the only sermon that has any power in these days is the "sensational" one. Too many sermons are dull and uninteresting. The devil of dullness must be cast out. The sermons of the eighteenth century were said to be of three grades of excellence—dull, duller, and dullest. Some even of the third class are found surviving in this enlightened twentieth century. No wonder the people sometimes rage and imagine vain things, have recourse to peppermints, or think of the roast that is cooking in the oven for the Sunday dinner, or fall into the gentle arms of sleep that eases the corner of the pew. Make way, then, for a bit of sensation in the sermon. It is needed to-day. It always was needed. Can you imagine John the Baptist returning and preaching among us to-day and not producing a sensation? Jesus was a sensational preacher if ever there was one. Bruce Barton did not find it hard to show this in *The Man Nobody Knows*. The great sermons of history have been sensational sermons. If they had not been, they would not be on record to this hour. Chrysostom was so outspoken that he got himself exiled three times and finally died from hardships away from home. It needed his sensational

preaching in a time-serving generation. Martin Luther in Germany, Savonarola in Florence, John Knox in Scotland, Hugh Latimer in England, are but typical of the preachers before and since who have blazed away with a courage that never wilted, rebuking unrighteousness in high places and low. Some of our friends who despise the sensational sermon would surely rather have sensation than stagnation. The Master's discourses produced a sensation. So did Peter's sermon on the Day of Pentecost. It had four points; they bristled. The preacher was facing the red-handed murderers of Jesus and he charged them with that murder and proclaimed the victory of Christ over all their devices. That sermon was followed by remorse, and the people cried out "What shall we do?" Paul's sermon on Mars Hill was sensational.

Someone asked Henry Ward Beecher what he thought of sensational preaching. He explained that if it meant the gaining of a low passing success by mere trickery, he was against it, but if it meant "preaching which produced a sensation", he was for it. But the minister who forgets that the Gospel is the real sensation, and depends upon his own peculiar methods and amazing fertility in conjuring up topics that will tickle and thrill, will have to go one better every week. He will merit the description by a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church: "He is like a dog with a can tied to his tail—he has got to run a little faster every minute to keep ahead of the can". It is so whenever a preacher ignores the "unsearchable riches of Christ" and becomes a dispenser of cheap wares, a commentator on current events, a provider of entertainment. We believe in wholesome sensation, even in a religious service, the kind that means a resurrection of some individual or of the church itself; for that is a sign of life. The pulpit should not become a Sunday supplement to the daily newspaper. The Church is not in the vaudeville business. Some clap-trap methods of ensnaring the crowd would do credit to a circus but are a disgrace to the Church of Christ, a dabbling in religious quackery. Here are some sentences from the sermon preached by Dr. C. E. Jefferson on the celebration of thirty years of service as minister of the Broadway Tabernacle:

> I am happy to think that I have never cheapened or vulgarized the Broadway Tabernacle pulpit. Broadway loves stunts, but I have never performed one. Broadway yearns for sensation, but the Broadway Tabernacle pulpit has declined to be sensational. There are enough cabarets and vaudeville shows on Broadway without a church adding to their number.

Significant, and worth pondering, for Dr. Jefferson's ministry was one of gracious influence and power. Significant also is this from a recent sermon of Dr. James Moffatt:

> You and I are among those who have come up to-day to worship God. Remember the great end of worship—to see

Jesus. For in seeing Him, in direct touch with Him, in realizing what He means and all He is to us—thus and thus only can we see the Father and be satisfied.

There is sensational preaching which burlesques the Gospel and degrades the Church. From this we turn away. But we plead for that which is sensational in the noblest sense, reverent, scriptural, spiritual, wholesome, producing a sensation by the power of the truth.

If the modern sermon is to find the modern man it must have certain qualities. We indicate some of them briefly.

It must be *intellectually honest*. It must keep abreast of truth. We live in a day when there is a marked impatience of closed questions, and the rank and file are "from Missouri", and will only believe on reason shown. They claim the right to open up any question afresh and thrash it out again and reach their own conclusions. There was some years ago a well-known college professor of the ultra-conservative school. One of his students asked him for a more modern textbook on anatomy, and this was the professor's reply: "Young man, no bones have been added to the human body since that book was written". It may be true that no bones have been added to the system of Christian doctrine, but surely we may hope that new blood has been transfused into it with each new generation. As A. M. Fairbairn once said: "We know Christ with an immediacy of knowledge the world has never possessed before". Knowledge is growing rapidly in every department of human inquiry, and the minister must be intellectually honest or he will lose the ear of the thinking men and women of our time.

It must be *fearlessly independent*. It must be manly; it must be brave. When a minister is afraid to tell the truth as he sees it he is handling the word of God deceitfully. If he is a side-stepper, uttering harmless platitudes because only platitudes are palatable, then gone are the days when the pulpit was a power and the Church an institution to be reckoned with. If the modern preacher can never hit out, preaching will soon be an abandoned industry with no power of appeal to real men, and the pews will be more and more deserted. The modern minister had better not have too many subjects on his Index Expurgatorius, for when he becomes the slave of any man or any number of men, or of any set of opinions—what is he? He is a mean little man who grows meaner every day, more to be despised than even the people who have robbed him of his freedom.

The sermon needed to-day must be *ethical*. It must touch the consciences of men. For Christianity is essentially a moral religion and stresses all the virtues. It does not make light of sin in any form, but exalts integrity of conduct. The sermon needed to-day will destroy our smug complacency by telling us that if we do wrong, and persist in wrong, we need not hope to escape the consequences by faintly trusting "the larger hope", or counting on our office in the

Church. Ethical sermons are needed to-day, tremendously needed when humility and repentance are becoming increasingly difficult for the people of western civilization, sated, as they are (especially in America), with the "creature comforts", and not a little with pride and power.

It must be *human*. A sermon is nothing if not human; it is mere empty sound and mockery. It must have the touch of life. It must by sympathetic, comforting. Joseph Parker voiced this essential when in an address to young ministers he once said: "Young men, preach to broken hearts". Dr. Alexander MacLaren had this to say:

> Never can I forget what a distinguished scholar who used to sit in my church once said to me: "Your best work has been to put heart into men for the coming week".

When the preacher's sympathy fails his power is gone. The sermon must be human, full of understanding, a rebuke sometimes, and again an exhortation, but . . . but comfort also, these three; and the greatest of these is comfort.

The sermon to-day *must exalt Christ*. Every sermon should have as its background, "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ". Christ is the transcendent message of the Christian pulpit, the sum and substance of all true preaching. Christianity is Christ. "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me". J. H. Jowett was a prince of preachers in our time, and "He made his hearers see how great and how near and how real Jesus Christ is. He never failed to do that". Perhaps this was why his sermons did not furnish "copy" for secular newspapers. But it was precisely this note that accounted for his grip upon the public mind throughout a quarter of a century. Let others lecture on literature, politics, science, and art, but the preacher must preach Christ, for Christ is coming into His own more and more among all peoples. "Sirs, we would see Jesus!" is no longer the cry of a few Greeks—it is the cry of the whole world. Christianity holds the future in its hands!

CAN WE JUSTIFY INDEPENDENCY TO-DAY?

By the Rev. J. M. Phillips, B.A.

Is our Independency only a matter of expediency, a method of government, or is it part of the revelation of God to us concerning the nature of the human soul and the purpose of our life here? If it was in history only a method of protest or an alternative method of Church government, then it is possible to say that though it once was useful and indeed necessary, it has become inadequate or unnecessary, and ought now, having made its contribution, to be merged in some more efficient form of Church organization. We ought not to go on living in the seventeenth century. Our teeth ought not to continue to be on edge because our fathers had to eat sour grapes. Those 2,000 ministers of the great Ejectment have made their noble contribution. They have, like all the martyrs, enriched the religious life of England with their blood. The Church of England would like to forget the Act of Uniformity, and we Independents need not exist merely to make them remember. But we were not born in the Ejectment of 1662, but in the Elizabethan settlement of the Church in England, which defined the Church as the nation on its religious side. The nation being regarded as constituting one religious fold, this fold was called the Church, and was, logically enough, organized for efficient government. It was not against hierarchical government as such that the Brownists protested. They protested against the conception that the nation, religiously regarded, was the Church. They re-affirmed the scriptural doctrine that the Church of Christ is the body of Christ; it consists of those who are disciples and believers. And we, like them, believe that men are not born into the English Church by being born in England, but are baptized into it by the spirit of God. A man is born into the Church when he responds to the love of God in Christ.

Here, thus simply stated, is the high churchmanship which was, and I hope still is, the foundation of our churches. Herein is the power by which our fathers opposed princes. They were not merely schismatics. They went forth bearing the cross of their separation in order to proclaim the crown rights of the Redeemer and assert the dignity and freedom and responsibility of the individual human soul. It was on this high ground that Cromwell raised his standard and rallied his Ironsides.

> The Congregational system or ideal is not a mere theory of Church politics or government, but fundamentally a doctrine of religion, a way of apprehending and realizing the Christian faith. Its ecclesiastical polity is but its doctrine applied to the exercise and cultivation of the religious life. Catholicism is a splendid system, even without the religious idea that fills it; but

> Independency, apart from its religious basis and ideal, is at once mean and impotent, impracticable and visionary. Our fathers held that legislation, civil or ecclesiastical, could not create a Church; conversion and converted men alone could. All were kings and priests unto God, and could exercise their functions only as they stood in open and immediate relations with Him. In His Church Christ did not reign while officials governed; He both governed and reigned. Over against the Puritan ideal stood the Anglican system, which, becoming in the hands of Laud at once sacerdotal and imperial, made the king absolute in the State that the priesthood might be supreme in the Church. That policy forced our fathers to feel that freedom, to reign in either the spiritual or civil realm, must reign in both: that there could be no Free Church while the State was enslaved, no enslaved State where the Church was free. Political liberty and spiritual religion were not two, but one; neither was possible without the other; and so for both Hampden died, and Milton pleaded and Cromwell fought.

So spoke Fairbairn in a memorable address to the Congregational Union[1].

"We have forgotten", says Principal Micklem (in his pamphlet, *The Church Catholic*), "that schism is a sin". If we have, then may God forgive us. But we are very much more than schismatics! We are dissenters. We dissent from a too narrow, too formal, too superstitious, too worldly conception of the Church of Christ in the world. But we dissent only in the sense that our Lord Himself dissented from the ecclesiasticism of His own time when He said, "Neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem shall ye worship the Father. But the hour cometh and now is when the true worshipper shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth. For the Father seeketh such to worship Him." If a place and a time are holy to us, it is only because we are not yet catholic enough to understand that all places and all times are holy to the spiritual man. We dissent because like our Lord we exist not to support a religion but to preach a Gospel—the good news of the grace of God. Where that Gospel is preached and wherever men respond—there is the Church of Christ. Always men tend to make the love of God too narrow by false limits and conditions of their own.

We dissent too from all that is implied in an order of the priesthood. There is nothing that a priest can do that the same man could not do if he were not a priest. There is nothing that a priest can do that a sincere Christian man, whether he be bootblack or merchant prince, cannot do. There is nothing a man can do that a woman cannot. The priest or the bishop, because he is a priest or bishop, cannot control the grace of God. It is not his to give or to withhold. I have in my youth been present at a Communion service con-

[1] *Studies in Religion and Theology*, 111.

ducted by a village blacksmith, a wise, single-minded, and gracious Christian, and felt the sense of the presence of Christ as nearly as when the feast had been spread by any other. There is no such thing as an invalid sacrament when two or three are gathered together in His name. "There am I", is the great promise, "in the midst of them". When God is there the priest doesn't matter. When God is not there, what does the priest matter? To assert that they who hold such beliefs and meet in such worship are "immature Christians", as we have been described, is to misunderstand us, and (what is so much more important) to misunderstand the mighty and tender catholicity of our Lord.

So we are Independents not through any sufficiency of our own, but through the sufficiency of God's grace in Christ, which no one has the right or the power to canalize through any order of persons or any kind of ceremonial. When the prodigal came home there was no gatekeeper to let him in or keep him out. While he was yet a great way off his father saw him and ran and fell on his neck and kissed him.

I will not, because I need not, linger on this familiar ground. But I have sometimes found it necessary to say that a Congregational minister is a member of his church set aside, by the call of God recognized by his fellow-members, for the special work of preaching and teaching and nurturing the flock of Christ. We have broken with the mystery religions because we have been admitted into the deepest mystery of all, the grace of God that makes us who were afar off nigh in the blood of Christ, wherein there is neither Jew nor Gentile, male nor female, bond nor free, priest nor layman.

Now no one is more aware than I am that this doctrine is very high, and on the heights the wind blows chill. It is a great freeing of the spirit to know that there is no respect of persons with God, until one realizes that that exposes us to all the labours and burdens of individual responsibility. We who are ministers are tempted to demand the shelter and support of an official status. I do not speak unsympathetically. Our real work is so responsible, so difficult, and so exhausting, that we feel we want help, almost any help, but our sufficiency is of God, not of some official status that the Church or the Union can give us.

Now all this matter of orders and status (you remember how our Lord would have none of it) is really unimportant, even trivial, if it were not for one inevitable consequence in the minds of the people. For it is not only or even chiefly the priest who wants to be a priest. It is the people who want him to be other than they are. They want official guidance, official assurance. They still say "Give us a sign". In his recent novel, *Star Begotten,* H. G. Wells writes:

> Hardly any of us grows up fully. Particularly do we dread and shirk complete personal responsibility. Man is the boy

> who won't grow up. Most of us to the very end of our lives are obsessed by infantile cravings for protection and direction and out of all these cravings come all these impulses towards slavish subjection to gods, kings, leaders, heroes, bosses. Our imaginations hang on to some such Big Brother idea almost to the end.

That is a violent expression of something we all recognize in ourselves when we are tired or uncertain, and we can see its consequences written large over the face of Europe to-day.

I heard one of our most eminent ministers once say in an address to the students leaving Lancashire College: "Whether you like it or not, you are a priest of God to your people". One of my deacons once told me the same thing. Now I know that I am not. I know I am a very ignorant and sinful man on whom God has laid the burden of the ministry; like Paul, "woe is me if I preach not the Gospel": but that deacon and a good many other people get some comfort from thinking that I am a priest. It is fictitious comfort. It is a symptom of spiritual immaturity and weakness. It is a refusal of personal responsibility before God. "Why do you not yourselves do right?", said our Lord to the Pharisees; but they preferred a sacerdotal legalism to the simple but strenuous challenge of their own consciences. We dare not exploit that weakness. It is one of the great functions of the Christian minister to summon all men to accept that challenge.

I have so far been concerned with the nature of the Church and of the ministry, but what we think about these derives from our conception of the Kingdom of God, which too often is held to be our Lord's version of Utopia. Indeed, one of the unexpected consequences of the great emphasis that has been put upon what used to be called the Social Gospel is that so many people have seen that the Marxist ideal is more easily obtainable and will come more quickly, and, very reasonably, if the Kingdom is a goal to be realized in history, they have preferred Marx to Christ. I know some admirable young men who have gone or who are going out of the Church because Marx will give them what they want in one generation. They agree that they will have to be "bloody, bold, and resolute", which is a pity but is unavoidable. The revolution will come like a surgical operation, painful but necessary and temporary, and when it is over the patient will be rid of the cancer of unemployment and economic insecurity. It is worth losing a little blood for that. And if I were not a Christian (though unworthy) I should, I think, join them. But I know a better thing—Christ's vision of the Kingdom of God.

"I have learned in whatsoever state I am therewith to be content. I know how to be abased and I know how to abound: everywhere and in all things I am instructed both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to suffer need. I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me". The man who wrote that knew that the Kingdom of God is within you. He had proved the promises of

his Lord. He had learned how to live and how to die, and death had no more dominion over him. Curious to think how separate from our material and physical condition is that spiritual elevation. All of us know much more and have much more of this world than St. Paul. We are centuries nearer the millennium, but who of us lives so nearly in the Kingdom of God?

God forbid that we should lack sympathy with those who suffer from the inequalities of our economic system, or from the weaknesses of our physical frames. We must do all we can, like the Good Samaritan, to bind up their wounds and take them to an inn. And we must rid society of its robbers. But I want a Gospel for a man I cannot help. I cannot wait for any Utopia. Karl Marx and the humanists have nothing for the man who is dying of cancer of the throat, or the woman, who has an imbecile child. Nothing less than a revelation from God can give us any light on the dark problem of suffering and evil. Nor does any other light shine in the darkness of death. But the revelation which has come to us in Christ does not promise us any release from suffering or any end to the conflict between good and evil in this world. It bids us take for our highest value human personality—a value higher than State, race, mankind, or Church—each separate, each of equal and infinite worth, each partaking of Time and Eternity, each a Word of God made flesh. Christ was crucified for insisting that the sun rose and the rain fell on the righteous and unrighteous alike, that goodness was within the individual soul, the eternal quality of personality. But even in His name the pure in heart who see God as He saw God have been persecuted as He was persecuted. There is no resolution in this world of the conflict between good and evil, of which all such persecution is part. Christianity accepts it, holding out no possibility that man and his environment shall become so harmonious that conflict disappears —that indeed would be death. We must remember that life itself is nonconformity. The only wholly conforming things are dead things. Through this ceaseless struggle in each human soul, which like our mortality is part of the conditions attached to the gift of life, a man climbs in the scale of being until he partakes of that immortality which is stupendously symbolized in the Incarnation and the Cross, where he is beyond happiness—for who asks if Christian men are happy?—and beyond fear.

The converse of this Christianity is Totalitarianism. Mr. Malcolm Muggeridge, in a recent review of Berdyaev's *The Destiny of Man*, wrote:

> Totalitarianism most hates what Christianity most prizes—the soul alone in the universe, defenceless, without history or knowledge or class or wealth or kindred or nationality, alone and asking, "Wherefore?" It wants to put out all inward creative fire. It wants a herd, fattening, improving its stock and its

> pasture, lowing in unison, and then marvelling at its own unanimous low, savagely destroying whoever and whatever disturbs this unanimity, falling down in awed worship before the image of itself, a herd. If for a moment you separate yourself from it and look at it appraisingly, you must be destroyed, for the Kingdom of Heaven is without and its critics are blasphemers.

The father of all Dictators, the supreme manifestation of Totalitarianism, is the Pope. In the name of Christ we protest; in the name of Christ we dissent, not because we are contumacious rebels or self-sufficient Nonconformists, but because we must be free as Christ Himself had to be free to preach the good news of God Who made the world, and made even the least among the children of men to be His own child, Whose love insists that none shall sell that tremendous birthright and Who will justify Himself throughout His creation in His own good time. This is the Gospel which alone makes the adventure of life endurable with all its suffering and evil, which would be unendurable if men were self-sufficient, and this world a complete entity in itself.

I know this is an unfashionable point of view. I feel the pressure of all the powers of the modern world that make for conformity and demand efficiency; but you cannot cast out devils by the name of Beelzebub. Christ died not for humanity, nor for the greatest happiness of the greatest number, but for men one by one because each was precious in the economy of God. To that ultimate value of the human soul the world must come back, for when all in this life has been achieved and all has been suffered the full significance of a man, the child of God, yet remains to be revealed.

With this Gospel we have been put in trust. Our real concern is not its present popularity but our own faithfulness.

DE QUINCEY ON THE LAST THINGS.

By E. E. Kellett, M.A.

The other day I happened to take up a volume entitled *De Quincey and his Friends,* by James Hogg—not the Ettrick Shepherd, but the publisher and the son of a publisher. Hogg was a close friend of De Quincey, and the editor of his uncollected writings.

I thought I knew my De Quincey, for I had read every word of Masson's monumental edition, and from my youth had been an enthusiastic admirer. What then was my surprise to see in this volume an essay with which I was totally unfamiliar! As may be imagined, I read it with intense interest—for interesting indeed it was, and the circumstances which led to the writing of it, as told by Hogg, were not less so.

In 1847 Hogg was editing his father's weekly, *The Instructor,* and had frequent conversations with De Quincey, many of which dealt with the problems of a future state.

> Again and again he recurred to the interpretation of *aionios,* until at length, in 1852, he said to me, "If I write this, dare you print it?" I replied, "I *dare*". Accordingly, the essay was written, and published in *The Instructor* in the first week of 1853.

Now, though the essay was re-published in a book called *The Wider Hope* (1890), along with contributions by Farrar, Plumptre, Baldwin Brown, and others, I imagine it has remained unknown to many of the present generation; and I think therefore some account of it may not be without interest at the present time. It is De Quincey all over: the introduction is longer than the essential argument, and it ends somewhat abruptly; but it shows the originality and profundity which always characterize him when he is in earnest, and is marked, at times, by the eloquence we should expect. But what makes it still more remarkable is the liberality of the tone, which De Quincey, a born Tory and an orthodox Christian, did not always show, and which is as noteworthy as the fearlessness with which Hogg published it, in Edinburgh and in 1853.

Beginning, as I said, with a long preamble, De Quincey discourses on the two audiences to whom he has to appeal, the learned and the unlearned. The learned may be a hundred out of ten thousand; but among the ten thousand there will probably be fifteen times as many *intelligent* people as among the learned; and to these, therefore, De Quincey addresses himself particularly. He informs them of the history of the Septuagint, and of the immense significance of the publication of that great work: of the "large range of influence and of silent unconscious operation", during three hundred years, "of the vast and potent ideas that brooded over the

awful Hebrew literature; the contagiousness, and preternatural shock, of such a new and strange philosophy, acting upon the jaded and exhausted intellect of the Grecian race". Legend might well ascribe to this translation all the characters of a miracle; and sober history may rank it among providential events. Yet, curiously enough, De Quincey refuses to concern himself with the connotations of the word *aionios* in the Septuagint. It is a translation of a Hebrew word, and may be inaccurate or insufficient. Our interest is solely in the originals; and, unless, like the Romanists with the Vulgate, we uphold a secondary inspiration as having secured a privileged version from the possibility of error, we must, for the purpose of our argument, concede to the Septuagint virtually no existence. We confine ourselves to the use of the word in the Greek New Testament alone.

Does then *aeonian*, in the Greek of *Matthew*, mean "everlasting"? It is commonly said that it must mean the same when applied to punishment as when applied to the counter-bliss of Paradise. Be it so; on the new interpretation loss may be balanced by gain; and in any case we have no right to reject a new construction simply because the consequences may displease us. The sole point is what *is* the sense and operation of the decisive word. And here there is no doubt. *Aeonian* means neither "eternal" nor "limited in duration". An *aeon* is the cycle of existence which belongs to any object, not individually, but universally in right of its genus. When Kant debated the question as to the age of the earth, he was not asking how many millions of years this respectable little planet had existed, but the stage in the whole course of her development which she at present occupies. Is she in her infancy, in middle age, or in senility? Her *aeon* is a certain average duration as applying to a planet in the Solar System; where, in that *aeon*, does she now stand?

Man too has his *aeon*—according to the Psalmist seventy or eighty years; it may possibly extend to a hundred or a hundred and twenty. Man *as a race* may have millions of years—an unfathomable mystery, deriving no light at all from the septuagenarian *aeon* of the individual; for the connexion between the two, though such a connexion may exist, will probably never be discovered. Similarly, a tree has its *aeon*; but what is the *aeon* of the species is totally unknown. One species of birds has recently become extinct; its *aeon* is accomplished, as that of the plesiosaurus was accomplished long ago.

Every object whatsoever has its *aeon*. Every life and mode of being must have hidden within itself the secret *why* of its duration. It is impossible to believe of *any* duration whatever that it is determined capriciously. Always it rests upon some ground, ancient as light and darkness, though undiscoverable by man.

And here, in one sentence, is De Quincey's central idea. "This only is discoverable, that the *aeon* or generic period of evil, tends towards a fugitive duration"—and that duration, as in everything

else, is relative to the nature of evil. It is like a square root, always the same in essence, but varying in every case according to the number on which the operation of extracting the root is performed. Thus, as evil is by nature temporary, so is its *aeon* limited in time; and, if we believe that good involves a principle of permanence, its *aeon* will be everlasting. Yet we are, in the two cases, using the word in precisely the same sense.

The conclusion of the essay I give in De Quincey's own words:

> That man (which is in effect *every* man hitherto) who allows himself to infer the eternity of evil from the counter-eternity of good, builds upon the mistake of assigning a stationary and mechanic value to the idea of an *aeon*; whereas the very purpose of Scripture in using this word was to evade such a value. The word is always varying, for the very purpose of keeping it faithful to a spiritual identity. The period or duration of every object *would* be an essentially variable quantity, were it not mysteriously commensurate to the inner nature of that object as laid open to the eyes of God. And thus it happens, that everything in this world, possibly without a solitary exception, has its own separate *aeon*; how many entities, so many *aeons*.
>
> But if it be an excess of blindness which can overlook the aeonian differences amongst even neutral entities, much deeper is that blindness which overlooks the separate tendencies of things evil and things good. Naturally, all evil is fugitive and allied to death.
>
> I separately, speaking for myself only, profoundly believe that the Scriptures ascribe absolute and metaphysical eternity to one sole Being, namely, to God; and derivatively to all others according to the interest which they can plead in God's favour. Having anchorage in God, innumerable entities may possibly be admitted to a participation in divine *aeon*. But what interest in the favour of God can belong to falsehood, to malignity, to impurity? To invest *them* with aeonian privileges, is in effect, and by its results, to distrust and to insult the Deity. Evil would *not* be evil, if it had that power of self-subsistence which is imputed to it in supposing its aeonian life to be co-eternal with that which crowns and glorifies the good.

THE GOLDEN MEAN IN THEOLOGY

By Dr. A. E. Garvie.

I.

(1) The greatest teacher at whose feet I have sat was Dr. Edward Caird of Glasgow University. Although I was led to reject his Neo-Hegelianism I learned from him a principle which in all the intervening years I have tried to practise, namely, the endeavour to think things together, to seek the synthesis of antitheses, the reconciliation of differences of thought. Truth is one, and what hinders the attainment of that unity is the common tendency to opposing extremes, such a partial apprehension of truth as leads to error, such a partisanship for one's own opinion as to provoke prejudice against all varying opinions. There seems to be even in philosophy and theology a pendulum movement from one extreme to another; such a movement may be necessary to keep a clock going; it can hardly be claimed as a condition of progress in thought. There is surely a middle way discoverable, along which a steady advance can be made. By disposition as well as by habit I seek "the golden mean" not of compromise, but of conciliation.

(2) What prevented my carrying out this principle in the Neo-Hegelian philosophy was just the principle itself: that philosophy itself seemed to be an extreme—it claimed to rationalize reality as its complexity forbids. Such a Hegelian rationalization as this—innocence is the thesis, sin the antithesis, and holiness the synthesis—offended my conscience. Human liberty introduces a contingency into history, which forbids the claim that reason can throughout it find divine necessity. We have here hope, not sight. *Solvitur ambulando.* The problem of sin and pain which our reason cannot solve, God's grace is solving in experience through faith. Recognizing thus that there are ultimate contradictions and oppositions in the realm of conscience, character, and conduct, we may yet cherish the conviction that, since the object of Christian faith is one, God as Father, Son and Holy Spirit, Creator, Redeemer, Sanctifier of man, the antitheses in Christian theology, due to this tendency to extremes, may be transcended in a synthesis, which excludes the partial error, and includes the partial truth of each contradiction, if we can discover, and practise, "the golden mean".

(3) There are antitheses which confront us at the very threshold before we enter the temple itself; and it would seem as if we had to fight our way between conflicting armies of Fundamentalists and Modernists, Catholics and Protestants, Dogmatists and Rationalists. Without discussing in detail what may be called the Prolegomena to Theology, let me in a few sentences indicate my position. I share the Fundamentalist's reverence for the Scriptures as the literature of

divine revelation through human religion without holding his theory of verbal inspiration. I apply the method of literary and historical criticism without recognizing any necessity to endorse the negative conclusions of many Modernists in regard to the objects of Christian Faith. I take full account of the Holy Catholic Church as the body of Christ throughout the centuries, but do not identify it with one ecclesiastical organization. I can find a way of reconciling the authority of the Christian community with the liberty of the Christian conscience. The revelation of God is not the product of merely human reasoning; but its content of history and experience must be apprehended by human reason. The Scriptures, the Church, and the Reason are not divergent, but convergent, approaches to the true and living Way to God.

II.

(1) The doctrine of the *Divine Fatherhood* as revealed in the Incarnation of the Son of God was a welcome relief from the current conception of God, in which were incongruously blended elements from the earliest with those of the latest stage of revelation. The universal grace of Christ to mankind was hailed as a Gospel displacing the inscrutable mystery of a discriminating election. I can still remember the happy passing from the one belief to the other. I for one do not want any return to Calvinism, and the miseries it inflicted on humble souls. But the pendulum swung too far the other way. This one aspect of the teaching of Jesus was emphasized to the exclusion of other aspects, in which He did not contradict the *ethical monotheism* of the prophets, and the witness of history to the inexorable moral order of the world, in which, while grace is offered to the penitent and believing, judgment still falls on the impenitent and the defiant. The love of God is *holy love,* and the end of that love is to save men from sin that they may become holy as God is. It is a false interpretation of Christ and His Cross that redemption alone is God's way with men, and that no retribution falls where redemption is rejected. Moral anarchy is not the sole alternative to saving grace. He who is not under grace, forgiving and making holy, is still under the law that every man reaps as he has sown. God is in His holy love so resolved to bring men into fellowship with Himself and likeness to Himself, that they who refuse the grace will know "the wrath of the Lamb". We do not abandon or limit God's love, but apprehend it is as it really is, when we do not think of it as good-nature that passes over sin lightly, but as good-will which in forgiving requires submission to His purpose to make an end of sin at whatever cost. There can be no peace to the wicked; God is a consuming fire to defiant unbelief; only by being agreed with God's will can man walk with God in blessed companionship. This seems to me to be *the golden mean* in the doctrine of God.

(2) It was commonly assumed about half a century ago that the

value of salvation through Christ depended on man's participation in the transgression of Adam, either as representative of the race, or as the source of man's natural corruption. Even when the doctrine of man's fall, original sin, or total depravity was not held in the extreme Augustinian or Calvinistic form, Darwin's theory of descent was regarded and resisted as an assault on the citadel of the Christian faith. Modern biblical scholarship forbids the assumption that the story in *Gen.* 3 can be taken literally as authentic history, and as the basis of the Christian view of man. Again we are witnessing the swing of the pendulum. Man, it is now said, is naturally good, by birth already the child of God; grace may improve, but need not renew, nature. Experience itself refutes this illusion. The evolution of the race has not been uniformly upward, but often downward. The development of the child even at an early stage shows desires and impulses which need restraint, as well as tendencies which deserve encouragement. Human nature is morally neither good nor bad; the animal inheritance and even the human holds peril as well as promise; it is the raw material which can be marred for evil or made for good. Even if there are grounds for a moderate belief in progress, it is neither uniform nor inevitable. History has shown and is still showing that man cannot by his own effort grasp in achievement what he can reach in aspiration. Without God's interest and activity mankind falls and fails. Grace alone saves, averting the peril, and fulfilling the promise of human nature. Man tends to fall back, unless grace enables him to rise; to reach the height, on which Christ stands as the pattern of manhood according to the will of God, man must be raised by grace. God must stoop to where man is to lift him to what he ought to be. The universal Fatherhood of God is eternal reality; man in time becomes the child of God as he is forgiven, cleansed, and hallowed by God. Who can measure the distance between the man who refusing and resisting grace becomes the slave of sin, self, and the world, and the man who accepting that grace lives in close communion with God, and growing conformity to Him? No man is good by nature; he can become good by grace alone through faith alone.

(3) As the love of God is revealed to and realized in man by Christ as Saviour and Lord, the doctrine of Christ's person is of crucial importance for theology. All the creeds and confessions of the Christian Churches assert the humanity of Christ, and anathematize any denial, but in Christian thought for centuries the divinity of Christ was so conceived as to make the humanity an abstraction void of any historical content. The Jesus of the Gospels was not altogether forgotten; but He could not be consistently fitted into the frame of the ecclesiastical dogma of the Incarnation. The Monophysite heresy was a more logical deduction from the current conception of the divinity of Christ in relation to the humanity than the formula

of Chalcedon, which juxtaposed the two natures—divine and human —without giving to the person a concrete unity. At the Reformation the Lutheran Christology reproduced Monophysitism, the Reformed the Chalcedonian, with even a tendency to the Nestorian heresy. If the dogmatic formulation involves either an absorption of the human by the divine nature, or a separation which makes the personal unity of the one Christ an abstraction, where does the error lie? It is to be found in so distinguishing the divine and the human nature as to make a personal union inconceivable. If God is the Altogether Other than man, how can the Word become flesh? The Kenotic theories which assume a surrender of divine attributes by the Word so as to reduce Himself to the measure of man, or the Kryptic, a concealment with possession of these attributes in the days of His flesh, are desperate expedients, *tours-de-force,* to evade the difficulty. Against this tendency to maintain the divinity by the surrender of the humanity the humanistic conception of the person of Christ is a reaction. All men are divine; Christ is divine only in a higher degree; He reveals the humanity of God. I cannot accept either the thesis or the antithesis. Man is not God, nor is God man; the use of the Latin adjectives human and divine disguises the fact that there is a difference between God and man, from which the ambiguous use of words affords no escape. God is Creator, Ruler, Father; man is creature, subject, child; and the relation of Father and child does not annul the difference of Creator and creature. What have been called the metaphysical attributes of God—infinity, eternity, immensity—do not and cannot belong to man, dependent, limited in time and space. If we may believe that there is such personal affinity between God and man that there can be personal relations, yet God's personality is perfect, man's imperfect, developing towards perfection. God is Father eternally, because He wills man's relation to Him as child, man becomes child of God in temporal process. God's infinity does not forbid His self-limitation in the Creation; His eternity or His immensity, His presence and activity under conditions of time and space. The *Kenosis* or the *Krypsis* is no solitary act of the Logos. God is ever emptying and hiding Himself in the world, and yet thereby fulfilling and making known the purpose of His love, His Fatherhood. In Christ is the consummation of this process, God Himself is in Christ, the Word become flesh, revealing Himself to man as man, and reconciling mankind unto Himself. God made man in His image for communion with Himself; manhood is capable of finding its fulfilment as the organ of God's self-manifestation and self-communication. The manhood of Christ was not absorbed or destroyed but perfected as God was present and active in Him; not a juxtaposition of natures, but a personal concurrence of God and man. In our brother-man we adore the Son of God.

(4) There is no ecclesiastical dogma of the work as there is of the person of Christ, and there have been numerous theories of the Atonement. Here a contrast presents itself between what have been distinguished as *objective* theories, such as Anselm's, and *subjective,* such as Abelard's; the Cross of Christ is supposed to meet a divine demand for ransom, propitiation, satisfaction, as a condition of the divine forgiveness, or to exercise an influence on man as an exhibition of divine love in evoking the penitence and faith of man. Dr. Forsyth, carried away by his love for antithesis, used to insist that Christ's action on God in His death was more important than His action on man. If God is in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, it is a false dualism thus to distinguish God and Christ. The Cross is not a sacrifice to God, but the self-sacrifice of God; so far as we may dare to penetrate the sanctuary of the relation of God and Christ we may say the Father suffered in and with the Son. Again, if there be this affinity of God and man, the demand of God and the influence on man should not be contrasted; what changes man must express God, because moving man's mind regarding sin to share the mind of God. What was necessary to man's salvation was necessary in God's sacrifice. As human love is displayed not in unnecessary but only necessary sacrifice, we may affirm that the holy love of God declared its judgment of sin in sharing the consequences of sin. I cannot work out this conclusion in detail; my present purpose is to show that we must seek a synthesis beyond either the solely objective or the merely subjective theories.

(5) God's love as in Christ saving from sin is most fitly described as *grace*; we connect grace with Christ, not as denying grace to God, but as affirming that it is in Christ that God's love pre-eminently manifests itself as grace. God's grace can be, and must be, received and responded to by man's faith. The Reformation affirmed that man is saved *sola gratia sola fide*. But this watchword was interpreted as meaning God's *omnipotence,* grace irresistible, and man's *impotence,* he cannot but believe. To explain why some received and some rejected grace, the mystery of the divine decrees was invoked, God predestined man to faith or unbelief, consequent salvation or damnation. Arminianism opposed Calvinism, as Pelagianism had opposed Augustinianism, and endeavoured to preserve human liberty and responsibility, but recognized the necessity of divine grace to salvation as Pelagianism had not. Melanchthon modified Luther's extreme position on grace and faith by his doctrine of *synergism,* a partnership of God and man. The rigours of Calvinism were modified even in churches professing a Calvinistic creed. The tendency in English religious thought (less Scottish) is to Arminianism or even Pelagianism; God helps those who help themselves. Man can do, and does, right with some help from God. In America this tendency was even more pronounced. Even in

Christian lives there was self-sufficiency. Continental theologians were shocked at the Stockholm Conference by what they called *Anglo-American activism,* human self-reliance instead of reliance on God; for this impression some American speakers were more responsible than the British. In Barthianism there has been a violent reaction, which has gone to the opposite extreme. I had no need to learn the truth from Barth, as I have always maintained the synthesis of divine sovereignty and human dependence, which is not divine omnipotence reducing man to impotence. Where the relation of God and man is conceived as love, there divine sovereignty and human freedom in dependence on God are not inconsistent. I do not like the term *synergism,* for God's relation in grace to man in faith is too intimate to be represented as a partnership of two separated persons. Faith is not a passivity, but an activity receptive and responsive to grace, and God's grace itself evokes that faith. What man does in faith, God does in him in grace. Man abides in God as God abides in man.

(6) If a previous generation was too "other-worldly" this seems to be too "this-worldly". While concern about future destiny should not displace interest in present duty, the present duty will be more adequately conceived in relation to future destiny. Man owes it to himself to make the best of himself for the continuance of his life hereafter, as he owes it to others to do the best for them for the maintenance of life here. It is an eternal life which he is called to live in time. When the conception of God as Father, the revelation of God in Christ, made the doctrine of eternal punishment incredible, the other extreme of universal salvation was asserted. Our faith in God's love may justify us in cherishing the larger hope

> That nothing walks with aimless feet,
> That not one life shall be destroyed
> Or cast as rubbish to the void,
> When God hath made the pile complete.

But neither Scripture nor experience of men justifies our teaching this as a proved dogma. God's grace is not irresistible, and we cannot affirm that none will resist it unto the end. So far as Scripture and experience, reinforced by the analogies of biology, lead to any theory, it is that of conditional immortality; souls that persist in refusing to adapt themselves to the environment of the eternal reality of God will gradually but inevitably perish; the doctrine of natural immortality is a pagan, not a Christian doctrine; man's life is *from* God and *in* God, and can claim and secure continuance only as it is *for* God. Reasonable as such a theory is, it is no article of my faith, as is the belief that the Judge of all the earth, who is the Father, will do right, the best that with all His resources He can do for all His children.

The concentration of concern in individual destiny was wrong in ignoring the universal purpose of God in human history. But the

reaction against this was also wrong in swinging like the pendulum to the other extreme. God's purpose will be fulfilled in the consummation of human history, but it is a return to Jewish literalism to suppose that the perfect Kingdom will be, or can be, on earth. Science in its teaching on the devolution of the solar system forbids the expectation that the material world in time and space can be the scene of the eternal Kingdom. The unnumbered multitude of those who have passed through the veil of death will not be recalled to earth. The latest generation of man will join the former generations in the unseen and eternal, not in the seen and temporal. There individual destiny and universal purpose will converge; the saints in glory will themselves be perfected, when Christ through His body, His complement, will have so completed all things in all men, that even His historical mediation will cease, and God alone will be all in all (*Eph.* 1^{23}, *I Cor.* 15^{28}).

Perhaps it is because there is always something bizarre about Mr. Rom Landau's writings that the prosaic reader is somewhat frightened by them, though they are always splendidly produced; in this, *Search for Tomorrow* (Nicholson & Watson, 10s. 6d.) is no exception, the illustrations being remarkably good. Mr. Landau describes his search in the Near East: he has visited Egypt, Arabia, Yemen, Lebanon, Syria, Palestine, Transjordan, Iraq, Turkey, Greece, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and has interviewed Rulers and Kings, Princes and Patriarchs, Scholars and Saints, Politicians and Publicists. While we should hesitate to accept Mr. Landau's judgment on every point—note the lack of restraint in his sketch of Venizelos—we are glad to have his impressions of the personalities, policies, and prospects of this vast and important area. He believes that Pan-Arabism and Pan-Balkanism are certain to come sooner or later, but that some spiritual foundation is needed before they can be built. He emphasizes the general decline of religious feeling and the flight from institutional religion. In general his position can be summed up in these words:

> Every intelligent Arab realizes that his country needs the helping hand of the West. But he will no longer accept that help if his instinct tells him that the hand has been stretched out merely to serve the hidden interests of Western banks, business houses or missionary societies.
>
> Common sense—if nothing else—should induce the West to replace the former philosophy of national selfishness by the ethics of Christianity. Unfortunately there are not sufficient men in politics or colonial administration with the spiritual convictions required for the adoption of the policy advocated by Lord Cromer.

"HERITAGE."

By R. R. Money.

There is a treasury of the heart for which the head is both seeker and custodian, and the things worth keeping have not altered in the memory of man. As far as our age is concerned, the middle days, after science had begun to come to our aid, were the spacious days during which most of the foundations of all art were laid and in many cases such a superstructure erected as we in our time may not achieve. To-day, cultivation of the arts is once more being crowded into the background through the increasing difficulty of the struggle for existence; therefore it is likely that those individual treasuries to which reference has been made will not only suffer in the collecting, but will even run risk of being rifled or abandoned.

If individual treasuries suffer, we may be sure that the national treasuries in the same order will tend to fall into unworthy hands. Although we may be forgiven if we fail to add to the national treasuries, we do not deserve to be forgiven if we fail to see to it that that which has already been collected is properly guarded. Therefore we should know something of the treasure to be guarded, for in the non-material world there can be no guarding without comprehension. This involves affectionate study, and the textbooks are not far to seek, being in every library and spread over the English landscape. The stories tell tales of surpassing interest or loveliness, thus by imperceptible means distilling their essence into our hearts and pouring sufficient strength into our minds to enable us in time to distinguish noble from specious, true from false, beautiful from meretricious. A taste for the finest in everything is almost always a cultivated taste. Thoughtful selective reading will encourage a response to the spirit underlying the stories of days when a golden glamour seemed to cast its warm glow over so much of life and of men and of an unexplored world. We can follow this gleam through many lands and through many pages of history and legend, but always it will be encircling the heads of men and women, and the touchstones of human worth and conduct will be found to have been piety, truth, and courage. When the time comes for the gleam to disappear, we shall find that though early childish wonder has to a great extent been replaced by steady faith and quiet acceptance, yet fear of God is still the foundation of a noble man, that honour is still the only thing worth seeking, that cowardice and lies are still contemptible whether met with in high places or in low, and that the honest work of men's hands is still the only visible contribution he can make to earth.

The men and women who live for ever in history and legend were in a tradition; so were the craftsmen in stone, wood, silver, gold,

marble, bronze, iron, and other material. They were not greedy to see the end of their work, being content if necessary to leave it for other hands to complete, so that the work were well done. Pecuniary reward meant little, the main compulsion lying within the artistic soul and under the fingers of the craftsman.

To an Englishman the whole of England is frozen history. With every advancing generation, names and territorial designations lose a little of their point. Landmarks, like tidemarks, have a way of disappearing unnoticed until it is too late to remedy the situation. Under the winds and rains ordered matter slowly surrenders, beautiful in its defeat. A great architectural monument standing ruined and roofless in the midst of sylvan scenery with short cropped grass for its carpet and peace and silence for its only garment, can be one of the most impressive man-created sights in the world. The ruined cities of the kings in the Ceylon jungles, Baalbec in Syria, and Angkor Wat in a clear space in the midst of the forests of Upper Burma, are more impressive than the Acropolis or the Coliseum, and the reason may not be entirely one of the number of acres involved, or the majestic design and execution of the builders; when man builds, he drives out nature, and the result may or may not be notable, but when a fine building falls into ruin, it seems to require the absence of man and the return of nature before it can become again both a joy and a wonder to the eye.

This country is rich in relics which remain to typify an age which is for ever vanished, and English country landlords and rural communities have realized how these treasures should be safeguarded, surrounding them with an enceinte which even the most attentive and well-mannered visitor must to some unimportant extent profane by his presence. It is extremely desirable that encroachments upon or within such enceintes should not be permitted, for they are essential to a complete and satisfactory appreciation of a relic of man's handiwork which has been handed back to nature.

The proper safeguarding of ancient monuments within still living towns or cities seems to require different treatment. If a building remains complete, then it can only properly express itself if we make constant and daily use of it. A complete building, empty and unused, is lifeless and uninteresting. Consider the difference between the Tower of London and the palace of the French kings at Versailles: the first is delightfully visitable because in its uses it still lives; the second, unused, is dead. It is the difference between china on a shelf in a drawing room, and china dignifying and ornamenting a dining table in constant use. Again we are fortunate, for responsible authority in many an English town or city has lovingly cared for buildings which, in spite of some inconvenience, remain in use by townsmen or citizens. An example of the other kind of preservation occurs in Rome to-day where, under Mussolini's

direction, remains suitable only for a glorious city of the dead are islanded in a city of the living, with incongruous effect. Happy instinct in this, as in so many other matters, has guided Englishmen up to the present: it remains for us to see that an ever encroaching, restless, heedless, hasty, and hard-tempered generation is not allowed too easily to interfere with the established order of preservation.

Picking up Mr. Shaw Desmond's *World Birth* (Methuen, 8s. 6d.) a visitor said ,"Whatever is this about?". Easier to ask than to answer! It is about politics, education, science, religion, and anything you can think of and double it! If Mr. Desmond had continued as in the first sixty pages where the residents of Wattle-by-Water discuss the state of the world, his book would have been more effective. But then we have 340 pages of exuberance, with allusions and misspellings which shake our confidence even if the style doesn't. The world is in a stage of transition, moving into a four-dimensional state. Science, politics, education, organized religion, as we know them are doomed—and Mr. Desmond belabours them unmercifully—if often deservedly. Layman are necessary to keep the expert in order, and "the day of Woman is here". In the new world we shall have a "religion of life", for "the ideas of Jesus are the only practical politics" (not of the churches; for we owe them to the blighting of the religion of Jesus by Paul):

> We are for the first time in history going to give Jesus a chance!

It can be imagined how Mr. Desmond roves about a world with no limits of time or space: incidentally he tells us that marriage is the greatest failure of any earthly institution and that "Men and women still know nothing at all about one another".

"There's nowt so queer as fowk", says the Lancashire proverb, and in a breathless age there will probably be some to whom Mr. M. R. Bennett's breathless survey, *Challenge!* (Longmans, 3s. 6d.) will appeal: his speed may be estimated from his statement:

> Close on the heels of the Reformation came the Industrial Revolution.

Well may the Archbishop of York begin his Foreword, "Well, well . . . Really now . . . Upon my word . . . ". Mr. Bennett sees the Puritans in power in England during "the horrors of the Industrial Revolution", and "For years the Puritans and the Catholics persecuted each other, even burned and beheaded each other", while Wesley "got so infuriated at the deadness of the Church of England that he charged up and down the country". We may smile at Mr. Bennett's haste and his style—"That is really too imbecile", "lots of people were terribly upset" (when Newman went over), and the like—and we may like his enthusiasm—"If industry can't be run on Christian lines, then it jolly well must be changed"—but travesty of history can do no good to anybody.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS.

This section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

CHRISTIAN UNITY: A MATTER OF LIFE AND DEATH.

By the Rev. E. W. Burt, M.A.

This article endeavours to approach the question of Unity from the point of view of the new churches established on the Mission fields. In the nature of things their perspective is different from that of those at the Home base, and all who desire to see those churches grow strong and indigenous should try to understand their position.

Now it is true that the majority of the converts on the Mission fields are not aware of the problem. They are for the most part simple souls who have been won for Christ, and they live and die amid primitive surroundings, knowing little of the actual conditions of the Church Universal. By the force of their circumstances and the limitation of their outlook they are blissfully ignorant of the divisions which exist in the Church. Indeed, their vision is necessarily limited by the little company of believers in their own village, or at best by the Association of similar churches in their neighbourhood. It is enough for them to learn the A.B.C. of the Christian faith and work it out in the petty round of their daily life. They *do* know that there is one great division between Romanists and Protestants, for the former were already on the ground centuries before Protestant Missions began. But the many divisions that exist between Protestants hardly come within their ken. They accept without questioning the teaching of the particular body that brings the Good News to them and know nothing of the others, for there is little overlapping on the Mission field.

But while this is true of the rank and file it is otherwise with the leaders, who have been educated in our schools and colleges and in many cases have spent years of study in western lands. These are the key men who count, and they are keenly aware of the divided state of

the Church and deeply deplore it as a hindrance to the spread of Christianity. The views now passionately held by the leaders are sure in time to permeate all sections of the Church. Now it is a significant fact that these leaders are calling more and more insistently for union and solidarity, and are fretting against the divisions which have been imposed upon them from the West. They have no interest in these things which we have inherited from our fathers. How indeed should they, for they have not the same background out of which arose our theological and denominational controversies?

Moreover, the weakness of the total Christian forces, ever exposed to persecution and in danger of being swamped by the mighty forces of idolatry, secularism, and Communism, makes it literally a matter of life and death that Christians should unite in a common witness so as to present one front to those who oppose them. How meagre are the total Christian forces will be realized when we state that in China there is only *one* Christian to a *thousand* of the population. If this little flock is split and divided it is obvious that its impact upon the surrounding society is so weakened as to become almost negligible.

The call to close up our ranks was clearly heard at the First World Missionary Conference held in Edinburgh in 1910, and it was intensified at the Second World Conference held in the same place in August, 1937. That Conference on Faith and Order was not merely a Missionary Conference, but included the representatives of 200,000,000 Christians, who spoke for the whole Christian Church, except the Roman Church, which declined to take part. It represented points of view as far apart as the Greek Church is from the Quakers, and all that come between these extremes. And among all the many voices it was noticeable that those which came from the Far East reiterated the urgent need of union. In this respect they stood far in advance of the more conservative Churches at home, and these latter will do well to heed the unanimous weight of the opinion of the new churches in India and China.

If we are honest we must confess that the voice of the old Churches is not always the voice of God. The Mother Church at Jerusalem was slow to give the right hand of fellowship to new Churches established among the Gentiles. There was a hot debate at the first Council at Jerusalem, and in the end it was not Jerusalem but Antioch that won the way to a larger liberty and saved the Church from the peril of becoming a Jewish sect. It was a minority that led then, and once again in the providence of God the privilege may be given to fresh minds, freed from our prejudices and traditions, to lead the whole Church in this matter. At any rate it is the Christian leaders from the Mission field who form the advance wing in matters of union. Let us not be deaf to their voice or indifferent to their appeal.

So much for the men who count most—the leaders in the new Churches. What now of the missionaries who trained these men? As a young man the raw missionary may go out loyal to his denomination and quite untroubled by this problem of divided Christianity. But the Foreign Missionary enterprise is an education of the most important kind, and the missionary himself quickly responds to this education. The vastness of the task that confronts him and the feebleness of the total number of men and women engaged in that task constitute a challenge he has not met before. Moreover, on the foreign field he is thrown into more intimate relations with workers belonging to other sections of the Church than would have been the case if he had remained in his home land, and if he be an open-minded man he begins to question, not indeed the truth of the views of his denomination, but the relative unimportance of these specific distinctions in view of the unspiritual mass around him. Before many years he becomes less interested in denominational differences and more concerned about the fundamental things which unite all Christians and in full sympathy with the views of the enlightened native leaders.

There has been real progress toward unity on the Mission field. In its development there have been three stages, each leading on to the other. Some Churches have reached the first, others the second, and still others the third stage. These stages are Comity, Co-operation, Union.

I. *Comity*. The dictionary defines Comity as courtesy and recognition extended by one body to the laws, customs, and institutions of others. It is the first and most rudimentary approach to unity, and without it nothing can be accomplished. The Romanists stand alone in refusing to recognize other Christian bodies. They claim that theirs is the one and only Church. Hence they strive to win converts from the Protestants. As long as this attitude is maintained it is vain to hope for any working understanding with Rome. Its dogma of the nature of the Church is an absolute bar to fellowship. Yet in times of famine Romanists cordially unite with Protestants in saving life. Thus by a curious irony we find ourselves at one in distributing the bread that perisheth, but not in giving the Bread of Life.

Between the other Christian Communions there is Comity, *i.e.*, they recognize one another and agree on division of territory. To this there are a few exceptions, such as Seventh Day Adventists, who deliberately gain most of their converts from other Churches. But on the whole the great principle of Comity is honorably observed. The great Societies stake out their respective fields after consultation with others and do not encroach on one another's territory. They regard others as equal partners in a common enterprise, and there is

no rivalry or competition, and members of one Church are freely received by another on letters of transfer without irritating insistence on uniformity. This matter of Comity is so important that it should not be passed over without comment, nor should it be taken as a matter of course. Comity really involves all that follows. For if once a Church sincerely recognizes another as a partner and agrees to a partition of territory, it really forgoes any thought of planting its own special flag in every part of the field. It not merely consents but rejoices to see others with different traditions from itself occupying territory it is unable to enter. For there is much land to be possessed and the task of evangelization is far greater than any one section can accomplish. Those on the foreign field claim no merit for the large measure of agreement they have reached. It is a virtue of necessity, but is none the less valuable on that account. From a purely denominational angle it may seem illogical, but love is greater than logic and love conquers all. There is confusion enough on the Mission field, but the loyal adoption of Comity has saved the situation and prevented the worst evils of sectarianism from being reproduced to the injury of the Christian cause.

One cannot repress a plea here that the same policy of Comity should be adopted more thoroughly in the home land. Many new areas are being occupied and the problem of providing for their religious needs is an urgent one; the only right way to solve the problem is by frank consultation and agreement between the Churches. To hoist the denominational flag everywhere would be suicidal. Again, in how many of our small towns and villages there is a redundancy of churches, each poorly supported and thinly attended.

II. *Co-operation.* The word defines itself. Comity proceeds mainly by limitation and partition of spheres of influence. Co-operation, on the other hand, is positive action bringing Churches into fellowship for common purposes. It is seen at its best on the Mission fields. The China Inland Mission—the biggest single agency at work in China—affords a signal illustration of the benefits of Co-operation, for it is both international and interdenominational. The Y.M.C.A., the Y.W.C.A., the Students' Christian Union, the Boy Scouts, the Bible and Literature Societies, *etc.*, are other forms of Co-operation. The Edinburgh Conference of 1910 gave a great impetus to Co-operation, for it led directly to the formation of the International Missionary Council and the National Councils now at work all over the world. In essence these are Federations, in which no denominational principles are sacrificed, but in which many different organizations are bound together for consultation, inspiration, and common action on all great issues.

In the sphere of Higher Christian Education Co-operation is now the rule, and it has abundantly vindicated its usefulness. No single

Mission is strong enough to found worthy Universities, but by pooling resources in men and money it has been possible to establish some ten union Institutions in China, wherein men and women of many denominations and nations work shoulder to shoulder in happy accord. Even in the Theological Schools it has proved practicable to train men for the ministry of many Churches. It is hardly possible to overestimate the value of such Co-operation. Thanks to it hundreds of well-educated men and women have enriched the life of Church and State, and are doing fine work as evangelists, pastors, doctors, nurses, and teachers. Though only one in a thousand of the population is a professed Christian, nearly one-fifth of the members of the Cabinet are Christians, and these have been educated in Christian Universities in their own land or abroad.

III. *Corporate or Organic Union.* This is the latest stage—and the most difficult. The two previous stages have, consciously or unconsciously, paved the way for this last venture of faith, for they have brought men of widely different schools into intimate relations, where each has learned much of his colleagues and each has contributed something new to them. Under the pressure of their environment the new Churches are feeling their way to real union. Here much patience is required and progress cannot be rapid. But some results have already been attained, notably the formation of the Church of Christ in China, which now contains one-third of the Protestant members in that land. It is made up of many elements—Presbyterian, Congregational, Baptist, Methodist, *etc.* The Churches which have joined have dropped their denominational labels and ceased to exist as separate organizations. But it is important to remember that owing to the previous adoption of Comity each of the combining sections of the Church of China is able to retain its own local autonomy and to teach its special tenets and practise its own rites within its own area as before. But the new Church has the advantage of having a central organization and council to which the component parts send their representatives, whilst individual members feel the thrill of inspiration of belonging to a large national body.

In South India, as is well known, a still bolder scheme of union is being considered which, if successful, will embrace Episcopalian, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregational elements. This scheme is meeting many obstacles, and still awaits consummation, but whatever be the result it shows the present trend of events. The Christians who live on the spot encircled by heathenism know how much is at stake and declare that union is a matter of life and death to them. That is the direction in which the tide is now setting, and the next few decades will probably bring many developments and some surprises.

The purpose of this article is not controversial, but rather informative. It has sought to state briefly what has been achieved and

what is being attempted towards Christian Unity and Union. The writer does not pretend to be without bias, for the matter here discussed has been one of his major interests for half a century, and he humbly thanks God that he has been permitted to live to see such a large measure of unity accomplished and such a hopeful promise of further progress in the years to come.

A MODERATOR'S IMPRESSIONS OF BRITISH CONGREGATIONALISM.

By Roger W. Babson.

Let me first thank the Congregationalists of England and Wales for their courtesies to me while I was in England during October. Everyone was very kind to me and I enjoyed every moment of the time. You have a great country and a fine group of people. I only wish you had had a different King in 1776, so that all of America would now be a part of the British Empire. Certainly both countries made a serious mistake at that time.

World War Influences.

The above statement is made notwithstanding the resolutions that were passed at our Indiana Conference, which took place while I was in England. One of the Press Associations sent a garbled report of my statement at the closing Bristol meeting that the Congregationalists of America will back England if ever necessary to defend civilization. A paid official of our Church made a spread-eagle speech censuring me. He is an eloquent speaker and worked up a "patriotic" and emotional enthusiasm for the "glorious United States" which caused the resolution to be passed. The resolution was further aided by a group of misguided pacifists in America, most of whom have never been abroad or know real world conditions. If they could realize the serious situation with which their English Congregationalist brothers are confronted, these resolutions would never have been passed.

Since returning home, I have been endeavouring to bring these pacifists up-to-date. They are being shown that no known defence has yet been discovered against the bombing plane. It is being explained to them that although neither Hitler nor Mussolini will strike so long as they are holding their positions at home, they will strike whenever they find themselves slipping. Of course, the hope is that they will not slip at home until England gets fully armed, after which they will fear to strike. On the other hand, American Congregationalists are being told that ultimately the bombing plane is likely to bring on a general European war and that it will absolutely be impossible for the United States to stay out of it. Were it not

for Great Britain, the Germans would now have naval and air bases in South America and Mexico. In the opinion of many of us Congregationalists, America can never repay what it owes Great Britain. So much for the resolutions.

Personal Impressions.

The Congregationalists of England and Wales have a fine group of preachers. I am not a judge of their pastoral work; but I believe that the English preacher is a better *preacher* than the run-of-the-mill in the United States. I was disappointed with the low preachers' salaries that are paid in England, although doubtless there is a difference in the cost of living between England and America. Apparently the English cleric is more of a *preacher* than a *minister*. I was particularly disappointed to find the Sunday Schools so weak in England. The attendance at the morning services in England is less than at our American churches; but the evening services in England have a better attendance. It may be that the total of adults who enter the church on a Sunday in England equals the total who enter on a Sunday in the United States, *per given church of equal size*.

My own feeling is that during the next twenty years very few new churches will be built while many now existing will be pulled down. Churches and preachers *per se* may have passed their peak. I believe that there will be more *ministers* serving their communities each year. *They will be given better parsonages and paid higher salaries.* I visualize, however, the future work of our ministers to be more in personal consultations and working with small groups. New parsonages, or manses, will provide for this new line of service.

Future Outlook.

The Oxford and Edinburgh meetings were rather successful from my standpoint. Protestants have been several centuries in getting into the present mess, and we cannot expect them to get out of it in a hurry. The different Protestant denominations must combine. There is no other hope for us. The first step, however, probably will be to reduce the number of our paid denominational officers. In my opinion, these men are the stumblingblock at the present time to church consolidations. They appear to put their own personal job ahead of the good of the Kingdom. I was delighted to find that in England there are more voluntary workers than in the United States. The English will be wise to hold to this programme and further reduce, rather than increase, the number of paid officials.

Now I shall say something very heretical. My statement will probably be followed by resolutions of censure against me at your next Assembly! This is it. While on the steamer returning to America, I had time to think over, quietly and prayerfully, our entire

Protestant situation. I wonder if Martin Luther did as good a piece of work as we credit him with doing? Would it not have been better if he and his group had taken more time to reform the Catholic Church instead of bringing about the split? I am rather inclined to believe that a mistake was made at that time. Certainly many mistakes have been made since by the splitting up of Protestantism into its different groups. I am a hundred-per-cent Congregationalist. If I came from the planet Mars a total stranger and studied all the different denominations, I would still select the Congregational. On the other hand, I am willing to go a long, long way toward having the Congregationalists consolidate with the Church of England.

Conclusion.

Chief result of my trip was an understanding of the seriousness in which the world is to-day. This seriousness is little realized by the Congregationalists of the United States. This is especially true of our Social Action group, who are preaching mere pacifism without any constructive spiritual note. I returned to America convinced that the churches hold the only key to world peace. The churches, ministers, priests and rabbis are the hope of the world. World peace cannot be brought about by treaties or referendums any more than by armaments. The choice is between Christ and chaos. Only as the hearts of men are changed will the problem be solved. It is a spiritual question and not a legal question. This is something that the pacifist and social groups apparently fear to recognize. Men can be educated for war, but cannot be educated for peace.

Only as a nation experiences a spiritual revival is it able to take the first real steps toward peace. Only as the democratic nations fearlessly present a united spiritual front can world peace be maintained. At Oxford we urged that different denominations should unite. How can we expect this until American and English Congregationalists themselves unite? Let us hope this may take place in 1940 at Wellesley, Massachusetts. As Benjamin Franklin stated in 1776, "unless we all hang together, we will all hang separately". To many this seems a fantastic thought; but to those of us who have carefully studied world conditions, it is a very sobering thought.

TAKING COUNSEL TOGETHER.

By the Rev. Leigh Waller, B.A.

At a recent committee meeting in the West of England the urgent problem of starting a Sunday School in a new housing area was mentioned. Owing to lack of time it was imperfectly discussed. At an evening rally which followed, the usual "preliminaries" took up half an hour. The address given was interesting and enheartening,

but the speaker was "imported", and nobody expected him to know the particular district and its peculiar needs. The question arose: ought we not to have set ourselves the discipline of attempting a full discussion of our immediate problem, planning the whole meeting solely to that end if necessary?

At another committee meeting a speaker commented on an extraordinarily large decline in the number of new church members in the district. Pressure of routine business, in his opinion, had prevented discussion of a most vital topic at the current County Assembly. Two mornings had been given up to matters that might well have been left for the committee or executive to deal with. Bigger issues were not tackled. All the meetings began with the usual introductory order: hymn, prayer, hymn, *etc.*, in spite of the fact that there were early morning prayer meetings each day, a devotional and preaching service, and a youth rally with full choral trimmings.

Is it not time to ask ourselves if we are not getting into a rut with our orders of services? May we never have a variation at any of our week-day meetings, or county meetings, that allows us to get straight away to business? Is it wrong to debate and discuss the work of the Kingdom without first singing a hymn? Of course, someone says, it does give the late-comer a chance! Let the late-comer look after himself; he does not deserve a chance.

The trouble lies here; we are hoping when we ought to be doing. We are dissipating devotion in a repetition of devotional exercises. We worship God just as truly by getting on with His work. Instead of voicing hopes let us voice plans. It means more effort, but that way duty lies.

Our fathers talked everything over in the prayer-meeting. For reasons not to be examined here the prayer-meeting to-day is largely neglected, but it is certainly not out of fashion because we find it less easy to talk. We make a mistake if, letting it go completely, we find no place for discussion of the matters which affect the well-being of our witness. The quality of our public meetings is high, very high. The addresses we hear warm our hearts. Yet ultimately we lose energy if we overdose ourselves with tonics.

We need more deliberative assemblies. For our present situation the remedy is not less talking, but more purposive talking. We need to take counsel together. How fond we are, as churches and associations of churches, of calling in the "star" speaker from the other end of the country! In every denomination there is a hierarchy of talent to be called upon. Do we need it quite so often as we imagine? Must we always be asking the master chess player to come down from London to tell us the next move on our board? Should we not do better to plan our own campaigns? Or is it that we want to save ourselves the trouble of thinking out what we ought to do?

We have no need to fear discussion. Suppose we had discussed

in the Assembly mentioned above the problem that was so immediately important. What was the cause of the unexpected decrease of new members? Why were some churches successful and others failures? The discussion would have been a salutary discipline, and the explanation would undoubtedly have shamed some of us. But shame would have been an excellent cathartic.

There are national, social, and denominational questions upon which we ought to be able to speak freely and then plan action as churches. Some of the questions confronting us are burning questions. At the Leicester meetings of the National Free Church Council the Assembly discussed Peace far into the lunch hour. Though the discussion was haphazard and chaotic hardly a soul left the building. At the last Baptist Union Assembly speeches on peace were given from representative points of view. It was a most absorbing morning, the only fault being that there was no allowance for open discussion. We have to fuse the two methods and have representative speakers with a planned discussion following.

Only the favoured go to our Assemblies and Union meetings, however, and we need to have more regular deliberative and purposive discussions in our individual churches. Let us use the talent we have, finding room for several speakers on the subject before us. We shall need to limit those speakers as to time, but we should give opportunity for the expression of every decided variation of outlook. This method may involve preliminary collaboration among the speakers themselves. We shall need a more parliamentary technique. We shall need punctuality in starting our business. And in concluding it! Much will devolve upon the chairman, who will have to direct the meeting towards conclusions and decisions regarding the action it wants. We need this new discipline: the discipline of finding out the immediate duty of our particular cause.

Have we the courage to attempt new ways, or are we too lazy to alter the ritual of our set orders of service? To be too lazy to change the order really means that we refuse to accept the discipline of the thought that demands action.

A VENTURE IN UNDERSTANDING

AN AUSTRALIAN EXPERIMENT.

By J. Harold King.

The following variation of the Missionary Banquet idea may interest and help. We called it "A Venture in Understanding". The young people of the church were told off into four teams representing India, Japan, Germany, and Russia. Each team was asked to make a study of the history, customs, and outlook of the country they were to represent, and on a certain evening provide a speaker to respond to the

toast, dress themselves and a table in costume, and give a couple of items illustrating the history, culture, or outlook of the country.

The work was well and enthusiastically done and when the evening came all was set out in order and character. The four tables represented India, Japan, Germany, and Russia, and those sitting at them looked the parts. National flags and symbols, swastikas, pictures of Lenin and Stalin, ornaments from Japan and India, trade and tourist posters, bright saris and kimonos, made a gay and instructive scene. For local reasons it was decided to take the toast list and items before the eating began. The Minister as Chairman, sitting at a larger table surrounded by the deacons and older people, opened proceedings with the loyal toast of "The King", and welcomed the various countries. Then each country in turn presented its items; the toast was proposed by a deacon, and the response made. The young men responding tried to do so in complete character, presenting the current viewpoint in each country. The Japanese items were a three-minute sketch of the life of Kagawa and a selection of music; the German, a brief talk on German music and a selection; the Russian, two scenes representing Russia before and after the revolution. The Indian item consisted of an explanation of the custom of presenting a necklace to a distinguished visitor and a necklace of clove was duly placed about the neck of the Chairman. The necklace used was lent by Rev. H. Leonard Hurst, L.M.S. Secretary, and was one actually presented to him in India. A brief act of family worship brought formal proceedings to a close.

The preparatory word and the function itself not only informed all who took part but also provided an excellent opportunity for fellowship.

A CHURCH MEMBERSHIP CARD.

The Church Membership card of Warwick Road Congregational Church, Coventry, may be of interest to other churches. It contains three pages which fold over. The first page contains the name of the church and its officers, a place for the name of the owner of the card, and the words:

> Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God.
> Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build my Church.

The three pages within contain the pledges for three forms of membership, Associate, Junior, and Church Membership:

Associate. I want to become a follower of Jesus Christ in this Church and promise that I will try, as an Associate Member, to make a better and a happier world by cheerfully helping others whenever I can and by being a loyal member of any organization to which I belong.

Junior. Because I wish to understand the Christian Faith and thus to fit myself to live the Christian life, I, as a condition of Junior Membership, promise to attend at least one of the Church services each Sunday, as well as the Members' Classes every quarter.

Church. The condition of the world is due to the sin and folly of men; it calls for a power to save it.

Because I believe there is power in the spirit of Jesus Christ to change human life, I commit myself, entire and whole, to Him and His service.

I, therefore, offer myself in a more disciplined loyalty to Him and a more devoted service.

I desire to do this through the Church to which I now belong and to bring my life and work to enrich its fellowship.

Under each pledge there is the name of the member, the date of the day on which the member was received, and a space for the signature of the secretary of the church or the particular branch.

Page 5 contains the Church's Pledge:

In the name of those here gathered together in this Church, we extend to you the right hand of Fellowship, and pledge you our love and loyalty at all times and under all circumstances.

We are one with you in the service of Christ and bind ourselves never to break the bonds of friendship here sealed in His name, either by word or deed.

Under this pledge there are spaces for the signatures of the minister and of the church secretary.

The back page contains the words:

Under the leadership
of Christ
And in the Unity of the Spirit
Let us go forward
In common fellowship
And with the infection of
A good courage
To the Life
That is Life indeed.

"TO SEEK AND TO SAVE."

"He waits, you say, for all who come?"
I cannot think that true.
Prodigal I, through all my days,
Are not the husks my due?
O, not for me the fatted calf,
Nor on my hand the ring.
I may not share the festal dance,
His love-song never sing.

Still, in my dreams, I journey home,
Then, waking, fear the way.
I am too sin-stained, sick at heart,
To bear his light of day.
I dare not look upon his face;
I have no love of tears.
Better that he should blot my name
Out of his book of years.

"He quenches not the smould'ring flax?"
Can he still care for me?
"The bruised reed he will not break,"
May I, then, succoured be?
I barred my heart against his way,
Is his step on my stair?
And if, at last, I ope the door,
Will he, then, enter there?

"He will come in and sup with me?"
My lodging, dark and bare!
May my sad swine-stained heart yet greet
A guest divinely fair?
Must I not say, "Depart from me,
A sinful man, O Lord.
A vagrant one, all desolate,
Wretched and self-abhorred"?

I am too shamed to go to him,
But, should he come to me,
Such wondrous grace would bow me down,
Down upon bended knee.
For love like that would flood my heart,
Cleanse it from dross and sin,
And upright I should once more stand,
The new life to begin.

NELSON BITTON.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS.

A LIBRARY ADVENTURE.

Some four years ago New College, London, was sold, and the activities of Hackney and New College, previously carried on in two buildings, were transferred to Hackney College, about a mile away. With a sublime disregard of the difficulties they were creating for future historians, the Governing Body decided that the name of the institution should be "New College," and one can imagine the bewilderment and blunderings of writers of Ph.D. theses in the year 2038. Such a one will discover, having eliminated a New College, Oxford, a New College, Edinburgh, and a Manchester New College (in London!) that New College, London, was opened in 1851, being an amalgamation of three institutions for the training of students for the Congregational ministry. He will find later in the century, also in Hampstead, a similar institution carrying the old name of Hackney (as a youth I always wondered what Hackney College was doing in Hampstead!). Even in 1924 all will be plain sailing when he finds an act of Parliament uniting the two Colleges and making them Hackney and New College. Then his troubles will begin. New College, our student will learn, was sold, only for a new New College to arise phoenix-like in next to no time. But where has Hackney College gone, he will ask? If he be lucky, and a history of the College, or this issue of the *Congregational Quarterly,* survive, he will discover that Hackney College lives in the new New College, and he will get a Ph.D. *cum maxima laude*. Why all this confusion was not avoided for the present and the future by calling the combined College the London Congregational College, thus signifying to the world exactly what the College is, is best known only to those concerned. When the Colleges are already united by Act of Parliament, the difficulties about varying trusts would be infinitesimal compared with future ambiguity.

But this is a digression. In one of those irresponsible moments which affect committees on somnolent afternoons, the College Council passed a resolution asking me to look at the Libraries of the Colleges, and advise what should be done in view of the impending sale of one building. The lighthearted way with which they did it suggested that I might slip along one day during the lunch interval at Lord's and give the matter all the necessary attention.

I found instead that I had undertaken what seemed more like a task of a lifetime. Talk about Augean stables! Are all Congregational libraries alike, I began to ask, for a life time's work is still needed on the Congregational Library in the Memorial Hall? I suggest that the Committees of all Congregational institutions give an eye to their libraries in order that they may be made as useful as possible, with obsolete matter removed, sets completed and made up-to-date, and repairs to bindings, *etc.*, effected.

Let me describe something of the filthy and fascinating work which has fallen to my lot in leisure moments in the libraries of these colleges. The first problem was at New College, the building to be sold. It had been decided to erect a new Library at Hackney College to house the resultant books—a worthy building which is to be opened by the Earl of Athlone on May 4th.

New College was an amalgamation of Homerton College, Highbury Academy, and Coward College in 1851. The books from these three institutions were brought together, and it soon became clear that even triplication had never been weeded out. In the course of its history the Library had had two splendid servants, many traces of whose work remain, in the persons of the Rev. William Farrer, Secretary of the College, and Dr. Newth, one of the "Revisers" of the Bible, a Principal who helped with the Congregational Library as well as that of his own College. Even these stalwarts had quailed before the task of tackling the almost intractable problem of a Library from three institutions scattered in many rooms: I had, in addition, the further duplication resulting from the amalgamation with the Hackney Library.

At New College I soon found I was in for a thrilling time. There were two rooms packed with books into which no one seemed to have ventured for a generation. Stuffed in a drawer, apparently unknown to anybody, was the copy of Isaac Watts's *Psalms and Hymns* which he had presented to Lady Abney, with his own inscription. There were rows and rows of obsolete theology—we have sold about ten tons of it to date (fortunately waste paper has gone up during the process and we are now getting double the price prevailing three years ago)—but in the middle of a shelf of such tomes would be hidden a first edition of Keats's *Endymion*, or a valuable copy of a work by Boyle or Priestley. This meant that every volume had to be examined individually.

As the time drew near for the sale and demolition of the College we were racing against time and working under difficulties. First the heating ceased; then the water supply was cut off, and the student Librarian and I would find ourselves at the end of a dusty day borrowing a pail of water from an adjacent house to make ourselves sufficiently presentable to face civilization. Finally, we were struggling along without light, heat, and water, and with windows removed. In the end, after sending up to Hackney books for current use, and all that could be housed, and after selling much for pulping and some of the duplicates and works not necessary for a modern curriculum, we had 193 boxes to go into store until the new library was ready.

Now they are all on College precincts again and in process of being arranged. And what a magnificent miscellaneous collection! The Council laughed when I offered them £5,000 for it, but wisely took care not to accept the offer. So long as 130 years ago, when the institution maintained by the Coward Fund was moved to Wymondley, Bogue and Bennett say that "the library, increased by the removal of the books belonging to Dr. Savage's Academy in Hoxton, is thought to be the most valuable among the Dissenters." From Coward College came hundreds of Doddridge's books, generally bearing his name in that beautiful clear hand in which he used to write to his "Dearest Creature". These are to be preserved in the Librarian's Room at the new building.

During the 18th century and early 19th century many subjects were included in theological training which no longer find a place—physics, chemistry, astronomy, botany, among others. Many of the books disposed of at the sales have been of this kind. A statement like "All that old science is junk and can be thrown away" could never be accepted, and no *carte blanche* order to destroy could ever be given. The first volume on a pile of presumably worthless books on science was Gilbert's *De Magnete*—the first book on physics to be printed in England (1600): it brought a mere £50. Last week Boyle's *Sceptical Chymist* fetched £15 10s. 0d., and many of these old science books have brought from 10s. to £3. A second edition

of Copernicus's *De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium* brought £14. I often tremble to think what books may have been thrown away from denominational libraries in the past, and I never consign to pulp volumes written in days gone by by the sweat of man's brow without sighing at the pathos of it all.

A good many books of travel were also included in the Library. Some of these were comparatively rare; the best price for a work of this kind was for an atlas—Cellarius, *Speculum Orbis Terrarum* (Antwerp, 1578)—£40.

It must not be supposed that by the sale of such books the College will make a large sum of money. Much more than the surplus remaining after the cost of storing, *etc.*, will be needed for the repair and restoration of the books kept. If only the bindings had received attention through the years the books sold would have produced fifty per cent more than they have done. Perhaps one of the main differences between theological college libraries and those in charge of trained librarians is that in the former it is nobody's business to see to the protection of books and no money is spent upon it. I must have handled hundreds of volumes, especially folios, with broken backs and damaged spines.

With the books now assembled at Hackney it is possible to realize something of the Library's wealth. Dr. Alfred Cave had made an excellent collection of modern books, and had spent money on keeping them in good condition. To them must be added books on English literature given by Mrs. Forsyth, and many on social questions presented by Dr. Garvie. The richness of the Library, however, lies in its older books, though Edward White's collection of books on the subject of immortality has grown into a section of the Library which must be almost unique. The Binney Collection no longer remains of any great moment, but books given by Joshua Wilson have more than ephemeral interest and value. Some other classes call for special mention:

1. *Dr. Pye-Smith's books.* Dr. Pye-Smith, Principal of Homerton, and a F.R.S., was a Hebraist whose learning was recognized by theologians and scientists alike. His initials appear in many volumes, often accompanied by remarks on the books. The extent of one's ignorance is often emphasized when one can tell neither the monetary value nor the scholarly worth of a volume.

2. *Deism.* As the constituent Libraries go back to the 18th century it is natural that they should contain many books on this subject. When they are arranged they will make an admirable browsing ground for students of 18th century theology. Some New College students will, I hope, take the opportunity of investigating the relations between the Deistic controversy and the thought of the Independent Churches.

3. *Funeral and other Sermons.* Again almost a unique collection. A smile can always be raised by referring to this collection of funeral sermons, but only those who have engaged in historical research know what a mine of information they contain.

4. *Tracts.* It will, I hope, be counted unto me for righteousness that I have resolutely resisted the temptation to examine in detail the books so classified, though I readily admit that I am looking forward to "the time of my life" when the opportunity arises to do so. These are volumes in which miscellaneous pamphlets are bound together, and there is literally no telling what might be found between the covers. Here is one picked up at random:

Morier.—Memoir of the Ottoman Campaign in Egypt. 1801.

Smith, J.—Examination of New Testament passages on the Person of Jesus. 1807.

Sinclair.—Observations on the Report of the Bullion Committee. 1810.

Byron.—The Bride of Abydos. 1813.

Malthus.—A Letter to Lord Grenville on the East Indian Company's Establishment for the Education of their Civil Servants. 1813.

Hall, Robert.—An Address to the Public re the Charter of the East India Company. 1813.

Elgin.—A letter of the Earl of Elgin to the Editor of the *Edinburgh Review*. 1816.

Smith, Thos.—Address to the Rt. Hon. Robert Peel, late Chairman for the Committee on Currency.

And here is another:

Middleton.—Vindication of Conduct on the *Furnace*, with the Log Book of the *Furnace*. 1743.

The Case of the Unhappy People of Custrin in 1759.

An Appeal to the People re Admiral Byng. 1756.

The Duke of Belle-Isle's Letters to the Marechal de Contardes. 1750.

A Collection of Severall papers re Elizabeth Canning.

I have said nothing of the books kept by the Coward Trustees in the Coward Room, sumptuously bound volumes which suggest the rich 18th century Dissenter. Of William Coward, the founder of Coward's Trust, the following story is told:

> Dr. Doddridge was a special friend of Mr. Coward's, and had under his care several ministerial candidates, supported by that gentleman. According to tradition, the merchant was very punctual, the minister less so; and when the former invited the latter to dinner, if he did not come exactly at the hour, the footman was ordered not to admit him. A gentleman who lived opposite was aware of the peculiarity, and his footman arranged with Mr. Coward's footman, than when Dr. Doddridge had been invited to dinner, mention should be made of it to the servant on the other side of the road, that a dinner might be prepared for his reverence there.

Of these books I may write at length when they come home out of store, just as I may write of some of the Library's greatest treasures. To-day I have handled both the Coverdale New Testament of 1538 and the Rheims New Testament of 1582, the first folio edition of the *Fairie Queene*, the *Admonition to the Parliament* of 1572, and most of William Prynne's writings.

Perhaps I have done enough to suggest that New College is fortunate in its Library. Many streams have flowed together to make it the broad river it is to-day. We have still some serious problems before the Library is satisfactorily arranged. If this should catch the eye of any College which would like folios of the Fathers or the Puritan divines, a message would receive speedy attention, while if any Nonconformist magnate requires a work—we will not say that no gentleman's Library should be without—but which will add dignity to his abode, there is available Hume's *History of England*. There are five volumes, weighing 25 lbs. each, measuring eighteen inches by fourteen by four, with margins three inches wide.

ALBERT PEEL.

WORTH NOTING FROM RECENT BOOKS.

We belong to a generation that has lost its way. Unable to develop the great truths which it inherited from the emancipators, it has returned to the heresies of absolutism, authority, and the domination of men by men. Against these ideas the progressive spirit of the western world is one long, increasing protest. Thus we have rent the spirit of man, and those who by their deepest sympathies seemed destined to be the bearers of the civilizing tradition have turned against one another in fratricidal strife.

WALTER LIPPMANN, *The Good Society*.

The notion that any enduring structure of society can be founded on man's duty to God is a dangerous quicksand, until we have grasped the truth rendered explicit by Jesus, that man's duty to God can only be rendered in so far as each man renders his duty to men. Our duty to God and our duty to our neighbour are aspects of a whole, as inseparable as the convex and concave sides of an arc. And who are a man's neighbours but all those who stand in need of man's help? The enduring society must be one founded on man's duty to man, as the only means of rendering man's duty to God. The first system of society which sank its foundations down to this bed-rock was the Greek Commonwealth. Too slight and imperfect to survive long, it revealed to mankind a secret which, once found, was preserved in the literature of Greece. So preserved it can never be finally lost.

LIONEL CURTIS, *Civitas Dei*.

Yet another subject which cannot be *taught* is religion. In the Elementary Schools the first twenty-five minutes of each day are devoted to "Scripture"—at least two hours a week; he would be a bold man who would contend that as a result of this instruction which has been going on since 1870, any noticeable strengthening of personal religion in the nation has resulted. If only this plain fact that religion is not a matter of instruction, but of inspiration and atmosphere, had been recognized sixty years ago, what a tragedy of sectarian squabbling would have been avoided. Several detailed "Religious Syllabuses" have been drawn up of recent years, such as the Cambridgeshire syllabus, but these are really not religious at all, they are systems of instruction on the Bible. It is a trite saying that religion is caught and not taught, and how far a school can bring its pupils to a knowledge of true religion depends almost entirely on the personnel of the staff. One teacher who reflects in his life the power of deep religious conviction achieves far more, even if he never teaches "Scripture", than a whole staff without such convictions who scrupulously follow a rigid syllabus. This is not to disparage the value of a study of the Bible and especially of the Gospels, but it is very doubtful if set periods for such study are fruitful.

E. E. REYNOLDS, *Freedom to Mature*.

Belief in the strength of pacifism among the electorate almost certainly helped towards the desertion of Abyssinia, towards the failure to check or even unmask the open intervention of Germany and Italy in Spain, towards the determination shown before and at the Nine-Power Conference to take no strong action even of a purely economic kind against Japan. To the extent that it has influenced the Government in these successive stages of its retreat from the short-lived stand for collective security in 1935, it has also no doubt encouraged the Dictator countries to plan further aggressions,

and when these occur it will help to secure the desertion of the victims. Simultaneously, the measure of the pacifists' contribution to the abandonment of the effort for collective security is also the measure of their contribution to the spread of Fascism and all that Fascism brings with it—racial and political persecution, use of torture to extract confessions, *etc.*—in those threatened States which in despair of the League are engaged in buying off the Dictators by accepting their ideology and their domination.

ELEANOR F. RATHBONE, *War Can Be Averted.*

Let us take the closest of all human relationships, namely, that of marriage. It has its basis in the physical attraction of the sexes, an attraction which is, of course, common to the whole of animate existence. Such attraction is not a social relationship; it is merely an instinctive means of propagation. It does not issue of itself in marriage as a social institution. Only when the family, by holding together as a unity, can secure some economic advantage, does marriage become a social institution. This is evidenced, not merely in primitive societies, but to an increasing extent in our own times. No problem is giving rise to more concern in the Church today than that of the gradual dissolving of the marriage tie. The Church describes this tie in terms of a metaphysical relationship. It is the union of soul with soul equivalent in character to "the unity which is betwixt Christ and His Church". But men and women today are in no wise impressed by this way of describing their marriage relationships; the Church cannot understand why her explanation of things makes no appeal. The reason is that metaphysical relationships are not vital urges along which humanity is forced to organize itself. Economic needs are what have to be taken into account here. The economic structure of modern society is to an increasing extent banishing the family as an economic unit. Where this process is furthest advanced there the marriage is the loosest. The collier and the navvy are dependent upon their wives for home, for food, and so forth; were they to become separated from them they would not be able to carry on their work. The result is that here the marriage tie is very close. On the other hand the economics of Hollywood make wife and home something that contribute in no sense whatever to the satisfaction of economic needs; the consequence here is that the marriage tie scarcely exists at all. If the Church is to restore the marriage relationship to what it ought to be, she must realize that it is not metaphysical relationships that bind people together, but the circumstances under which they are forced to live and the institutions they build up in order to meet those circumstances. That metaphysical, or if we choose to call them so, religious relationships exist among humans, and that marriage is one of them, is undoubtedly true. But they are rooted in economic relationships, and if they are to be maintained or changed this can only be done by maintaining or changing the character of the economic relationships in which they are grounded.

E. E. THOMAS, *The Political Aspect of Religious Development.*

Few people can realize today to what an extent their ordinary conversation is coloured by the Hebrew scriptures. When a man escapes by the skin of his teeth, when he goes down to the sea in ships, when he enquires whether a leopard can change its spots, when he threatens to make his enemy lick the dust, he is not so much quoting the Bible, as using Biblical phrases which have become an inseparable part of his language. The way of a man with a maid, the tale that is told, the multitude of counsellors, the crown of her husband, the pride that goes before a fall, the bread of idleness, the way of an eagle, the apple of the eye, the wife of a man's bosom,

the love that is strong as death, all became naturalized in English through familiarity with the Proverbs of Solomon. In chapters xxx and xxxi of that work alone it is possible to enumerate no fewer than twenty-four passages which are familiar to every Englishman in his daily round. Even so unecclesiastical a conception as "a thirsty soul" (not necessarily used today in its original meaning) is based on *Prov.* 25^{25}. "He who runs may read" is a mere mistranslation of *Hab.* 2^{2} (the correct rendering is "He who reads may run"). . . The list could be protracted indefinitely. Similarly, we owe many phrases to the earlier Prayer-Book version of the Psalms, based upon Coverdale's rendering. There is only one work the influence of which on the English language is comparable to that of the Bible—the plays of William Shakespeare. But, as has recently been demonstrated, Shakespeare's use of the Bible was itself very considerable, and its stimulus may be traced throughout his writings.

CECIL ROTH, *The Jewish Contribution to Civilization.*

The main reasons for the power of Islam are its tolerance, its practical character and its democratic spirit. Islam began as the religion of a dominant, fighting aristocracy. It was intimately connected with the nationality of the Arabs and in its early stages was national and exclusive. In extreme contradistinction to this, Christianity began as a supernational religion, linked to no particular race or class. It was not the creed of an aristocracy but of the "proletariat", and was the democratic religion *par excellence.*

Not only in their beginnings were Islam and Christianity very dissimilar. In their later developments, too, they moved in diametrically opposite directions. Christianity crystallized into institutions, and split up into national sections—the Roman Catholic Church, The Greek Orthodox Church, the Lutheran, the Reformed, the Free Churches, and so on. The very guardians of Christianity formed an aristocracy with an ecclesiastical hierarchy.

Islam underwent the opposite process. From its national and social exclusiveness it developed into a universal religion, flowing downwards to the masses. It is not without significance that whereas Islam created an Empire, Christianity was adopted by an Empire—that of Rome. Islam produced no ecclesiastical hierarchy, it did not split up into many national churches and it succeeded in producing a real democracy. Racial or national pride is unknown among the Muslims. Whosoever accepts Allah, be he negro, Arab, white, or yellow, prince or beggar, is regarded as an equal, not only in theory, but also in practice.

ROM LANDAU, *Search for Tomorrow.*

FOREIGN REVIEWS.

The Missionary Problem in Church History. By PROF. LIC. ERICH VOGELSANG, Giessen. Reviewed in Kirche im Angriff, XIII, 5, by DR. DOUGLAS HORTON. Translated and reduced.

The missionary problem in church history is a perennial one. It comes up among the problems of Christian thought in every age under various names and yet with the same content: with Paul as the question of the "old and new Adam", with Augustine as "nature and grace", with Luther as "knowledge of God according to the Law and according to the Gospel", in old Protestant orthodoxy as "general and special revelation", with Hegel as "Christianity and religious history", with Kierkegaard as "religiosity A and religiosity B", and to-day chiefly as "religious culture and revelation". The problem of preaching the Gospel comes to every Christian missionary in India and China precisely as it comes to every Christian in Germany who is seeking the right words by which to convey the Good News to non-Christians. It is in a true sense the theme of all church history. The one question is: how can the Gospel which came with Jesus Christ into the world of Old Testament and late Judaic life and thought be preached in new thought-forms to other peoples, times, and races—without being hopelessly misunderstood? In the last analysis it is the same question which faced Paul at Athens, Tertullian at Carthage, Ulfilas among the Goths, and Luther in his translation of the Bible—and indeed faces every mother when her child asks her for the first time, "What do you mean by 'holy'? What is death? Who is God?".

I

The difficulty and inevitableness of the missionary problem are brought to light, from the viewpoint of language, when it comes to translating the word "God" into Chinese. The choice must be between "Shen" (the Taoist principle of the god-spirit, which is also the highest element in human nature), "Shang-Ti" (the supreme Confucianist emperor-god-heaven), and "Tien-Chu" (the Buddhist king of the spirits of heaven). The crux of the difficulty does not lie in the choice between the Taoist, Confucianist, or Buddhist expressions so much as in the ambiguity, which must occur in any case, as to whether the real Jesus Christ appears here in a new name, or only the old Chinese belief. Linguistically the ambiguity is practically impossible to avoid. For instance, "Christ is Shang-Ti", that is, "Christ is thy fate", can be taken in two senses. It means either: what you seek and mean and describe as Shang-Ti or fate or as the ultimate divine secret has in truth been revealed in Jesus Christ. Or it means: Jesus Christ—that is only another new name for what in natural piety you know and reverence as Shang-Ti or fate! In the first instance Christ would be master of the man in his ultimate understanding of himself; in the other case Christ would be a mere adjunct to natural piety.

When now one considers that behind every decisive conception, behind the Chinese "Shang-Ti" or "Tao", as behind the Hellenistic *logos* or *kyrios*, there is an entire world, a "culture", naturally and historically conditioned, the real missionary problem comes into view; and we ask, Can God's revelation in Jesus Christ, which became flesh in a quite definite human *milieu*, pass from one people, one culture, one racial soul, to another without being, even for linguistic reasons, hopelessly misunderstood? Or in missionary preaching may the "Word", Jesus Christ, ever anew become flesh?

II

It may be taken for granted that the Christian belief of the Early Church, like the preaching of Christ Himself, was cast primarily in Old Testament and late Judaic forms. That the Messiah and the Law, the kingdom and the last days, the covenant idea and the idea of election, represent a specifically Old Testament and late Judaic type of thought, that Jesus took this whole world of belief for granted and by the authority of His Sonship gave it at once a quite new and quite un-Judaic meaning—so un-Judaic that the Synagogue sent Him to the cross as a blasphemer—that Jesus both destroyed and fulfilled the world of Jewish life and thought, liquidated *and* preserved it, the New Testament witness is clear. How could Jesus in His own person and in His place among His people in His time have become the Word, the utterance, of God to them, if He had not been willing to talk in plain Aramaic about "the son of David" and "the son of man", about fasting and the feasts, about the old and new covenants, the children of Abraham, and the final kingdom? This destroying *and* fulfilling, this yes and no to the Jewish world of belief and speech raise difficult questions for the church historian:

1. Were not all these conceptions sublimated by the New Testament subject to the possibility of relapsing into their original Old Testament and late Judaic meanings—by the earthly law of gravitation, by the power of the "human" element, the dead weight of the "old Adam"? Did not the great re-Judaizing process of the first three centuries consist in just that? The praise and love offerings (*eucharist* and *agape*) gradually revert into Old Testament sin-offerings ("the sacrifice of the mass") and call forth a new Levitical priesthood, with its synagogal power of excommunication and its bent toward heresy-hunting. Jewish legalism, with its "fasts, prayers, and alms", new Philonic allegorizing and speculation, Jewish apologetic and apocalyptic, and above all the Old Testament system of rewards and punishments—these win new, or more accurately, win back, their old authority. Does this "falling away from the Gospel" represent the inner fiasco of Christian missions? By it do the human factors in religion prove themselves stronger than God's revelation in Jesus Christ? Is the "old Adam" a greater historical power than the new creature in Christ?

2. Could Christian belief conceived in late Judaic categories ever have mastered the Hellenistic world? Can the answer which God has given in Jesus Christ to questions regarding Himself suffer transference into another cultural world, which asks its questions about God differently? Must not the early Christian creed, "Jesus is Lord", be misunderstood where "Lord" is not the "Lord of hosts", Lord Sabaoth, but only one of the many "lords" of the mystery religions? Can the messianic theology of the early Christians be understood where there is no messianic hope at all; can Jesus's word about forgiveness be really heard where there is no real consciousness of law, sin, and wrath? Would not the Greeks therefore have to become Jews not merely according to the law of circumcision but according to the law of their whole life and thought before they could become Christians? Must not all true Christians first be Jewish Christians? Or, on the other hand, is this just the "false doctrine of the Judaizers" against which Paul struggled? Must not Jesus appear in Judea as the expected Messiah, but in Greece as a philosopher, in Asia Minor as a god of the mystery cults, in Rome as a ritual and moral teacher? Even if we judge this to be a falling away from the Gospel, a relapse from revelation into human religion, the question still remains: can it be otherwise?

III

This missionary problem has been seen, I believe, by no Christian thinker so clearly as by Paul. If this is the case, it is right to call him *the* Apostle, *the* missionary *par excellence*. The often involved form of his thinking is due to his concern to translate not merely language but reality. That missions must produce a complete revolution in thought and that such a revolution must always involve risk was not lost on Paul. At the point where for the Jews there is the question of the Law, he sees for the Greeks the question of nature (*Rom.* 1 & 2); where for the Jews good works are the way of salvation, he sees that for the Greeks *gnosis* takes the supreme place; still more incisively, where for the Jews there arises the question of the Messiah, he sees for the Greeks the question of the Hellenistic *kyrios* and omits the theology of the Messiah cherished by the Early Church; he even ventures to put in parallel the idea of the table of the Lord and that of demons (*1 Cor.* 11). Why is there lacking in Paul Isaiah's conception of the "servant of God", while the question of sonship to God assumes so important a position? Why does Paul practically leave out of consideration the matter of repentance, so central for the preaching of Jesus (the exception in *2 Cor.* 12^{21} is negligible), and bring out in his doctrine of baptism (*Rom.* 6) a parallel to the Hellenistic mystery religions? Why did he withhold from his readers Jesus's decisive description of Himself as the "son of man" (Daniel's *bar-nasha, ben-adam*), and very boldly translate the phrase for them as the "second Adam" or "man from heaven" (*Rom.* 5^{14}; *1 Cor.* 15^{47})? Because he knew that the Christian mission demands a complete revolution out of one world into the other, because he did not believe that the "nations" had first to be introduced into the religious thought-world of the Jews before they could become Christians. This is Paul's struggle for "freedom from the Law" against Judaism and against every re-Judaizing of the Gospel.

His most daring piece of translating, if we may consider him the author of *Colossians*, is in *Col.* $1^{13\text{-}20}$. Here Christ is preached "in the gnostic language": in Him is created not only the "all", but even the "thrones", the "dominions", the "principalities", the "powers"—in him dwells "the fullness (the *pleroma*) of the Godhead". Is the historical Jesus Christ lost here in a confusion of cant gnostic phrases? By no means, though Paul does consciously risk the ambiguity which attends missionary preaching. "Christ is the heavenly man, or the pleroma" may always have two meanings:

Either in the true sense: your "heavenly man", of whom Plato and Philo speak as the original of whom we should be copies, is as a matter of fact not an idea, but is the man Christ Jesus of history, after whose image God Himself desires to form us (*Rom.* 8^{29}). What you gnostics mean by "the pleroma of Godhead" and do not quite fully understand is the truth given us "bodily" in Jesus Christ. This is daring preaching: this is preaching Christ "in the gnostic language".

Or in the false sense: the same sentence, "Christ is the heavenly man, or the pleroma", may be turned around to mean: Jesus Christ is nothing more than what you Platonics and gnostics already know in essence. This is only another name for your "heavenly man", your "pleroma".

This double meaning of the sentence, "Christ is the heavenly man", defines the risk and danger of missionary preaching. Whether I say, "Jesus is the *logos*, the spirit, the Lord", or whether I say, "Jesus Christ is the satisfaction of justice, the sacrifice", or whether I say to the Chinese, "Jesus Christ is Shang-Ti or Tao", these translations, though quite unavoidable, are all ambiguous. If the translation is rightly taken, then the

"principalities", the idea of the heavenly man, the curse of the law, the compulsion of fate, the "influence" of the stars, lose their religious authority, their divinity. If the translation is falsely made or wrongly taken, then the "principalities" and "powers" simply take over the name of Christ, that is, the belief in Christ becomes a mere Roman-Judaic religion of law, a Hellenistic popular philosophy, an Oriental *gnosis*, a neo-Platonic mysticism, a belief in fate, a Confucianism, or a secular "social gospel".

When can the missionary hope that his always ambiguous translating will be rightly understood? The answer is: when the heavenly Father sends His Holy Spirit (*cf. Mt.* 16^{17}): "No one can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost" (*1 Cor.* 12^{3}). As it is not a question of transplanting a human religion from one cultural area to another but rather of declaring God's revelation in Jesus Christ to other people in their own tongue, the achievement of making that revelation really understood and believed can be only the miraculous work of the Holy Spirit. Since, however, God will not give His Holy Spirit without the "external word", there remains, on the human side, the missionary's task of putting the new meaning into old words. Reference to the miracle of the Holy Spirit will not magically mediate to the Chinese and Japanese the categories of Western thought. The translation of the "external word" in the context of its historical, spiritual, and racial background is therefore an inexorable missionary necessity—though there must always remain in the venture a humanly irreducible remnant of ambiguity.

IV

The history of the Church is not then the history of the development of a particular type of piety, theology, or polity, but is concerned with the struggle between God and men's thoughts about God, between revelation and religious culture, between the "new Adam", that is, Christ, and the old Adam in the midst of the dominant "powers". Christian history so understood is the daily new entrance of Christ into the midst of rising and decaying cultures, into the hearts of living—and dying—men.

The History of Primitive Christianity. By JOHANNES WEISS. Completed after the author's death by Rudolf Knopf. Translated by four friends and edited by FREDERICK C. GRANT. New York: Wilson-Erickson. Two volumes. $10.00[1].

At last the *magnum opus* of Johannes Weiss is available to English readers. He was engaged in writing it when death overtook him, after 51 years of active life, on August 24th, 1914, at the outbreak of the World War. Though his chair at Heidelberg is today nobly occupied by Dr. Martin Dibelius, the memory of Dr. Weiss still lingers in the lecture room where he first made public the leading ideas of this book. As he had finished the first half of it and all but completed the second half, it was possible for the late Dr. Knopf of Bonn to write the final chapters from outlines which he left.

It is one of the most satisfying books in the field of church history that the present reviewer has read for many years. The translators, who are colleagues of President Grant in the faculty of Seabury Western Theological Seminary at Evanston, Illinois, are to be congratulated upon the excellence of their work. The lucid and readable style of the original has not been lost. The encyclopedic knowledge and genuine religious insight of the author are as clearly expressed in the English as in the German. If Weiss's life had not been cut short by a death so untimely, he would doubtless today have espoused the school of "Form Criticism", of which,

1 The English edition is published by Macmillan. 42s.

indeed, he may fairly be called the forerunner. It is a fact of importance that President Grant, one of the leading exponents of form criticism, has been able to edit this book and by the use of notes at the foot of an occasional page bring it abreast of the best scholarship of today.

Though St. Paul occupies the centre of the stage for Weiss in his history of the early days of the Church, the author by no means neglects the background of his hero. His knowledge of the Roman Empire of the time of Augustus and after, and of the Hebrew traditions in which Paul was nurtured, keeps his perspective true. Paul is seen as a man of his own day, but possessed of human prejudices and loves which make him a man of every day. The new life which came to him in Christ, the new sense of victory over every circumstance—this made him, with all his human weaknesses, the most dynamic man in the empire. Weiss sees in Paul's experience on the Damascus Road the key not only to the resurrection appearances of the other disciples but to the life which characterized the early Christian *koinonia*. However modernity may discount the form of that experience, it is clear, as the author points out, that there was a spiritual content in it which is normative for Christian experience in every century.

The book is divided into five sections. I. The Primitive Community. II. The Gentile Mission and Paul the Missionary. III. Paul the Christian and Theologian. IV. The Missionary Congregations and the Beginnings of the Church. V. The Separate Areas—Judæa, Syria, Asia Minor, Macedonia and Achaia, and Rome.

This is a book not merely for the scholar but for the minister, for it lays its emphasis upon those qualities in the Gospel and in the early missionaries of the Gospel which avail for personal triumph over sin and the fear of death even today. The early Christian faith is depicted as having as its centre not the cross but the risen Christ.

DOUGLAS HORTON.

The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man. By R. OTTO, E.T. by F. V. FILSON and B. LEE WOOLF. Lutterworth Press. 15s.

Der Mensch im Widerspruch. By EMIL BRUNNER. Berlin : Furche-Verlag. R.M.12.

The Distinctive Elements in Christianity. By KARL HOLL, E.T. by N. V. HOPE. Clark. 2s.

We warmly welcome this admirable translation of *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man,* and we congratulate the Lutterworth Press for its courage in publishing this English version at a price considerably less than that which we in England had to pay for the German original on its publication in 1934.

In a long review of the German edition in these columns we have already given a full summary of Otto's book and sought to indicate its importance. This book, with Gloege's *Reich Gottes und Kirche im Neuen Testament* (published in 1929 but still, alas !, untranslated), marks a new stage in the study of the significance in the New Testament of the Kingdom of God. Otto's book goes less deeply than Gloege's into the meaning of the New Testament terms, but it has a breadth of treatment due to Otto's studies in the history of non-Christian religions. Thus, in the Introduction to his treatment of "The Kingdom of God in Christ's Preaching", Otto traces the antecedents of our Lord's teaching on the Kingdom through Jewish and Iranian Apocalyptic back to the teaching of the Kingdom of Asura—of those ethical gods of the *Rigveda* of whom Varuna was the chief. Otto concludes this section thus :

> The kingdom of God was for Christ always the future kingdom of the new age, and was conceived on strict eschatological terms. It was to follow on the Messianic woes and the divine judgment. But what distinguished his own eschatology from previous forms was, on the one side, that he already lived in the miracle of the new age which was active even in the present; that with clear vision he saw this as something already developing and growing around himself; that he knew himself to be supported by powers which, as *aparche,* were already penetrating the world, and, supported and filled by these powers, he worked and preached; on the other side, that through works, speech, parable, and charismatic bestowing of power, he mediated contact with this miracle of the transcendental as a private possession to a circle of adherents who came into his train.

Otto then proceeds to discuss "The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man". Jesus was different from all merely prophetic persons; He was the eschatological Saviour who Himself was an integral part of the *Eschaton; i.e.,* He "had the nimbus of the Numinous". Like most modern scholars, Otto sees in our Lord's teaching here "the synthesis between the Son of Man and the suffering Servant of God".

Of especial interest is the third section, "Christ's Supper as the Consecration of the Disciples for Entrance into the Kingdom of God".

> The first and immediate point of Christ's action was the strictly eschatological reference to inheriting the kingdom of God. That was important also for the practice of the rite as we observe it to-day, and for a critical understanding of it. Our practice points to forgiveness of sins as the essence of the significance of the rite. That is not wrong, for forgiveness of sins is implicit in the act of participating in the consecration and atonement effected by the suffering of the Servant of God. Nevertheless it is not correct, for the means is unduly emphasized to the detriment of the purpose. In Christ's teaching, which was meant to be logical eschatology, forgiveness and expiation of sins were not the purpose itself, but only the means to the eschatological final goal. They were means whereby men might enter into God's kingdom, whereby sinners, when redeemed, might be able to see God.

The last section of the book deals with "The Kingdom of God and the Charisma".

> [Our Lord's] charismatic gift was not an accident in him, but was of the essence of his person, and helps to reveal its significance. And only when we understand his person and its meaning is the meaning of his message of the kingdom disclosed. The kingdom for him was the inbreaking power of God unto salvation, and he was not a rabbi but an eschatological redeemer, who was an integral part of the eschatological order itself. Charisma and kingdom of God belong together by their very nature and they illuminate one another.
>
> [That the] church has lost its charisma, that men look back to it as to a thing of past times, that men make it and the inbreaking kingdom belonging to it trivial by allegories, does not show that this church is now on a higher level, but is a sign of its decay.

We hope that this suggestive and learned book will be very widely read, and because of our appreciation of its importance and relevancy we suggest that in later editions the numerous foreign words should be put into brackets or footnotes and English words substituted in the text.

Brunner's *Man in Contradiction: The Christian Teaching on the true and the actual Man* is an immense book of nearly six hundred pages, and,

like many other German works, would be clearer were it less diffuse. We had intended to give in this review a short summary of its contents. Happily that is now unnecessary as Brunner has himself given an outline of the teaching of this book in his essay contributed to *The Christian Understanding of Man,* the second volume of the series, *Church, Community and State,* published in connexion with the Oxford Conference, and we would refer our readers to that summary. In books on Systematic Theology the section on "The Doctrine of Man" is often the least suggestive. Brunner's rich and subtle book shows how relevant to our modern situation is the Bible doctrine of what man is and what he is meant to be.

Welcome as is *The Distinctive Elements in Christianity,* it would have been still more welcome had it been issued in 1925, when its German original, entitled *Early Christianity and the History of Religions,* was first published. At that time the "Religio-Historical" School had much more influence than it has now, and there were many who sought to explain away the Christian message as the product of contemporary cults and fancies. Early Christianity, we were told, was a mystery-religion, differing from pagan mystery-religions only in this: that in it the myth of a dying and risen god was associated with the gracious figure of Jesus of Galilee. Two years after Holl published this brochure, Reitzenstein published the third edition of his book on *The Hellenistic Mystery Religions,* in which he admitted that much of the evidence he had adduced was irrelevant, and there is now increasing recognition by scholars that the Christian Gospel is not thus to be explained away.

Reitzenstein, like many other leaders of this "Religio-historical" school, was a philologist and not a theologian. Holl, who understood—as Reitzenstein did not—what religion is, did useful service by his emphasis that a religion lives not by what it has in common with other religions but by its distinctive elements. Thus the first Christian preaching owed its power not to its resemblances to pagan myths but to its proclamation of forgiveness of sins through the Saviour God had sent; for this message of forgiveness there was no parallel in the pagan environment of early Christianity. Had the leaders of the "Religio-historical" school known anything of the actualities of missionary work, they would have realized in advance the inherent absurdity of their claims that Paul, for instance, derived not merely the form but the content of his message from those among whom he worked. Men do not face the privations of missionary service unless they feel that they have a Gospel to proclaim which those to whom they go need much to hear. Holl's brochure by its sanity and wisdom made a very useful contribution to the controversy. It is still worth careful study, for it is written by one whose great learning was equalled by his insight.

This is, we believe, the first of Holl's writings to appear in English form. At this time, when we are preparing to celebrate the Reformation, is it too much to hope that some publisher will be bold enough to publish an English translation of the first of the three volumes of Holl's collected works—that great volume on Luther which is indispensable to the knowledge of what Luther really taught and yet is still inaccessible to those who do not read German?

SYDNEY CAVE.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

"A good book is the precious life-blood of a master-spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(*The place of publication is London unless otherwise stated.*)

Civitas Dei. By LIONEL CURTIS. Longmans. Vol. II, 12s. 6d.; Vol. III, 5s.

Two years ago we reviewed the first volume of this remarkable work, the aim of which is to "discover a guiding principle in public affairs". In Vol. I Mr. Curtis saw the ideal for society in an international commonwealth, the Sermon on the Mount translated into political terms. Vol. II essays "the task of describing the world situation as I see it". All students of history and all engaged in public life or desiring to understand international affairs should read it. It is packed with pregnant sentences, as, *e.g.*,

> The hierarchy, more concerned with the strength of their organization than with the principles which ought to inspire it, claimed the sole right of interpretation.

Then there are interesting judgments about men: Botha is the greatest man Mr. Curtis has known, and he agrees with Milner that Mr. Lloyd George as a war minister was even greater than Chatham, though he wishes he had shown the same courage in leading opinion when making the peace:

> He will figure in history, I think, as one great as a man can be without principle, on a level therefore lower than that where men like Chatham, Washington, or Lincoln will stand.

Mr. Curtis believes that no time in history appears

> so fraught with disaster to the human race as a whole as the present,

and deliverance is impossible unless men think of a scheme of human relations which will incarnate the teaching of Jesus.

Vol. III, applying the principle set out in Vol. I to the situation described in Vol. II, sets out the belief that a path through the thickets of life can always be found by deciding on the ultimate goal. In the course of the application we are often brought up sharp by sentences like the following, which start us on long trains of thought:

> The theory of direct revelation unconsciously assumes that God waited to reveal himself and his ways to men until men had at last invented the difficult arts of writing and reading.

What is the purpose of God through history? God is supremely creative, and the meaning and purpose of life is creation, for which men have been endowed with reason, conscience, imagination, and freedom. If the inseparable duties to God and neighbour are accepted, the result on character is immense, and on society, too, as seen in the Greek city-state.

> For both Hebrew and Greek, goodness finds its creative expression in the conduct of men to each other; they came to see that, in serving each other, men serve God and become like him.

This God is Father, as Jesus taught; the idea of God as Father was lost in that of God as Sovereign until the 19th century.

A valuable chapter on "Political Thought and the Churches" should be read and digested. Statesmen cannot release human affairs from the present impasse until the Churches have created the public opinion on which they can act; academic circles must work out the policy the Churches can support, as they have supported the League of Nations.

Mr. Curtis asks:

> So long as people refuse all final allegiance to a sovereignty wider than national sovereignties, can they hope to rise to a higher plane of civilization? Can a system of compact between these sovereignties, however developed, act as a real preventive of war and establish the rule of law between these sovereignties?

What way out does Mr. Curtis suggest? That Australia and New Zealand and then Britain should unite, so that their citizens learn to look to a wider authority than one purely national; other nations will gradually join in, and the international commonwealth will gradually be established.

EDITOR.

The Fulness of Israel. By W. J. PHYTHIAN-ADAMS, D.D. Oxford Press. 8s. 6d.

Dr. Phythian-Adams's new book resembles his earlier one, *The Call of Israel,* both in its merits and defects. It is written in a vigorous and attractive style with an enthusiastic purpose. This purpose (in the present volume) is to interpret the history of Israel as a *praeparatio evangelica*. He takes the history in four sections, namely, that prior to the settlement in Palestine, the Exodus, the period from the settlement to the exile, and the exilic together with post-exilic period. The scale of treatment is much fuller in the earlier than the later parts, as is to be expected. The author rightly treats the history as a whole, and protests against the selection of prophetic passages, for example, to the neglect of the details of the general history, but he relies too much on the dubious canon that a tradition is to be accepted until it is disproved. The previous question should always be: "Has the tradition itself any evidential value?", and the answer will differ in different cases. The author's generalizations are sometimes too sweeping, as when he says that subjection to the Persian or Macedonian or Roman "kept the Jews continually seething on the verge of rebellion". He is also too fond of extracting allegorical meanings, and the rather puerile device by which he makes his chapter headings spell out the name "Jesus" belongs to the Sunday school rather than to the serious student. Whilst the author can be sweepingly critical on occasion, he is much too ready to accept uncritically some particular point of view, such as that of Garstang's concerning the date of the destruction of Jericho. No hint is given that other competent archæologists assign a different date, which would profoundly modify much of what Dr. Phythian-Adams has said. With all these qualifications, however, the book has good qualities which make it well worth reading, in particular the author's sense of the theological meaning of the history and its revelational value. In this respect, the book is a useful corrective of a purely antiquarian or formal interest in the historic details. Even if the total effect may seem to be a re-writing of Jewish history from the Christian standpoint comparable with the work of the Deuteronomist (though with very different canons) this kind of approach is necessary in order to show how essential a place the Old Testament has in the Christian Bible.

H. WHEELER ROBINSON.

Ancient Hebrew Poems: metrically translated with introductions and notes. By W. O. Oesterley. S.P.C.K. 6s.

Dr. Oesterley's anthology of biblical Hebrew poetry is intended for those not able to extract the meaning and force of the Hebrew without help. His selection ranges from the Song of Deborah to Judith and Ben Sirach, and in each instance he gives a brief critical introduction, a translation in which he has been at pains to bring out the metrical stress, and notes on words or phrases which seem to need elucidation. The book will be useful to beginners and to those who have not a sufficient supply of good commentaries at hand. There is nothing distinctive in the quality of the translation, which is intended to reproduce meaning rather than literary quality. Dr. Oesterley seems sometimes too dogmatic in the statement of his views, as when, for example, he dismisses the collective characterization of the Servant of Yahweh, in *Isaiah* 53, as being "absurd". This is hardly the right term to describe a view seriously argued and strongly held by so many scholars, including Professor Eissfeldt as one of its most recent representatives. The fact that Duhm had used the word before him should have been a warning rather than a justification. But the book as a whole should be very helpful to the class of readers for whom it is intended.

H. Wheeler Robinson.

The Christ of the Gospels. By P. Gardner-Smith. Heffer. 8s. 6d.

Matthew, Mark and Luke. By the late Dom John Chapman. Longmans. 25s.

Mr. Gardner-Smith, already known for his scholarly investigations of the narratives of the Resurrection and the Church in the Roman empire, has in this study of the Gospel records applied the same critical canons that he used in the first of the above mentioned books. After some introductory chapters on Palestine, the later history of the Jews, and the Gospels as the sources of our knowledge (including some sagacious observations on form-criticism), he follows the narrative of *Mk.*, supplementing it by reference to the other Gospels.

This plan rules out any detailed study of the teaching of Jesus, the aim being to appraise the Gospels as historical documents, and so make a way for reconstructing the main facts of the life of Jesus. The author's conclusion is *in medio tutissimus ibis,* avoiding on the one hand the Scylla of a priori assumptions that the Gospels are wholly true to history, and on the other the Charybdis of Loisy and Guignebert which makes them mainly pious legend. Like F. C. Burkitt, he stresses the importance of *Mk.* as presenting a genuine historical outline, and calls our attention anew to the problem of the rise of Christianity:

> No account of the Person of Jesus that fails to do justice to His influence in His own age and in the centuries that followed has any claim to our respect.

This is a book worth buying and reading again and again.

The late Dom John Chapman, abbot of Downside, was recognized as one of the leading *N.T.* scholars of his generation. This book is the record of his conversion (in 1916) from the "two document" hypothesis (rejected by the Papal Commission 1912) according to which *Mt.* and *Lk.* are mainly dependent on *Mk.* and Q, to the more traditional and "Catholic" theory of mutual or successive dependence, and in particular to the priority of *Mt.* *Mt.'s* Aramaic Gospel (Papias's Logia) was used by *Mk.*, whose significant omissions indicate dependence on *Mt.* Then came the Greek *Mt.* (substantially identical with the Aramaic, but in partial dependence on *Mk.*),

and finally *Lk.*, following *Mk.* closely and to some extent depending on *Mt.* (though some demur to this). Dom Chapman's one deviation from this hypothesis is that the Greek rather than the Aramaic *Mt.* was Mark's chief source "in the sense that Peter when preaching at Rome" (a contention far from certain) "had the Greek *Mt.* before him (to refresh his memory!) and adapted it in his own way to his hearers' needs".

It may also be noted that Dom Chapman posits a first draft of *Lk.* (dependent on *Mk.* and slightly on special sources), before the final form in which the first draft was reinforced by further use of special sources and by the Greek *Mt.*

This brief outline will suffice to show that the author's work (which has been edited by Mgr. John M. T. Barton) is of a revolutionary nature. We have become so accustomed to the notion of the priority of *Mk.* and the existence of the hypothetical Q that it is a shock to find the former dethroned and the latter described as a myth. And though it must have been a great satisfaction to Dom Chapman to find himself in agreement with the Papal Commission, this does not strike us as the work of a mere traditionalist. He may be assailing an "impregnable rock", but he does it with the approved weapons of modern textual mechanism and the skill of a scholarly tactician. The defenders of the current theory will have to reckon seriously with many of his contentions. A weighty book in more senses than one.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

An Introduction to the New Testament. By K. and S. LAKE. Christophers. 7s. 6d.

A Modern Introduction to the New Testament. By GUY KENDALL. Methuen. 7s. 6d.

Neither of these books is on the conventional lines: they do not fall into the class represented, *e.g.*, by Peake, McNeile, and Clogg. For that reason they deserve a welcome all their own. It would not be unfair to suggest as an alternative title to Dr. and Mrs. Lake's volume, "Brush up your *N.T.*", especially as they have in mind, among other prospective readers, students who have left College.

No attempt is made to deal with the theological or ecclesiastical problems (see, however, occasional passages like pp. 172 f.) arising out of the modern study of *N.T.* The books are taken in order and their literary facts and critical problems discussed *seriatim*. An apology is offered for the comparatively slight treatment of the Fourth Gospel, and its problems are handed on to the younger generation of scholars as "a field white unto harvest".

It is not possible here to discuss details. But it may be noted that Dr. Lake accepts, if not wholeheartedly, *2 Thess.* and *Col.*, and with the latter, *Eph.* (no mention is made of Goodspeed's theory). He inclines to an Ephesian imprisonment for *Phil.* and *Phm.*, and to the late date (Trajan and Pliny) for *1 Pet.* (there is no reference to Streeter's discussion in *The Primitive Church*).

The survey of the separate books is followed by four valuable chapters on the background of *N.T.*, and three appendixes dealing respectively with chronology (this should be compared with Dr. C. J. Cadoux's article in *Journal of Bib. Lit.*, Sept., 1937), topography, and quotations from early Christian writers. The bibliography is unhappily imperfect—an almost incredible omission is Dr. W. F. Howard's *Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation*. But we rejoice that the right-hand page headings are indicative of the contents (authors and publishers please note!), though on pp. 67 and 69 "of *Acts*" should be added. Finally it may be said

that whatever our satisfaction or disappointment with Dr. Lake we dare not miss anything that he publishes, and this stimulating book is no exception to the rule.

Mr. Kendall's book is a further happy illustration of the increasing attention given to biblical studies by teachers in our secondary schools. He writes with an eye not only on senior forms, but also on the "general public", and while, like the Lakes, he presents his readers with problems and indicates an "approach to their eventual solution", he does not confine the problems to the structure, authorship, *etc.*, of the various books, but includes such emergent topics as the Messiah and the Kingdom of God, the Christian ethic, miracles (including the virgin birth and the resurrection), church organization, justification, sacraments, and sacrifice. The book thus introduces the reader to the thought of the *N.T.*, and it does so very lucidly and competently. In spirit and temper as well as in method it attempts for the *N.T.* what Mr. Gardner-Smith's book noticed above does for the Gospel story. There is something wrong with the references to "Chapter VI (ii)" on p. 89, and "Chapter VI" on p. 100; the latter should be "Chapter II".

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

According to the Hebrews. By HUGH J. SCHONFIELD. Duckworth. 10s. 6d.
The Gospel of Peace of Jesus Christ by the disciple John. Edited by E. SZÉKELY. Daniel. 3s. 6d.

The Gospel according to the Hebrews is described by M. R. James as "a divergent yet not heretical form" of our *Mt.* and secondary to it. It has been the subject of many controversies, but it existed in Hebrew or Aramaic and was used by the Jewish Christians known as Nazaraeans. A number of fragmentary references to and excerpts from it are found scattered in early Christian writers, especially Jerome, and perhaps the well-known Oxyrhyncus sayings are extracts from it. The question is further complicated by early references to another gospel (or gospels) variously described as "of the Ebionites", "of the Twelve", or "of the Apostles". If it could be recovered it would be an important witness to the primitive Jewish Christianity of which we know so little.

It seems hopeless to look to Gentile Christian tradition, but Mr. Schonfield believes that light is forthcoming from the Jewish side. There exists a Jewish *Life of Jesus*, the *Toldoth Jeshu* ("Generations of Jesus", *cf. Mt.* 1[1]), which in its original form goes back to the fifth or even the fourth century. It is

> a polemical work in Gospel form, agreeing in many places with the Synoptics but also containing independent material including certain additional *O.T.* Messianic proof-texts. . . It is in effect a parody of an uncanonical gospel of synoptic type.

Mr. Schonfield's contention is that this gospel is *Hebrews* and that by studying the *Toldoth Jeshu* we can recover its structure, just as we recover the *True Word* of Celsus from Origen's reply to that work. There are also traces of an "Acts of the Apostles" attached to the *Toldoth Jeshu*, which strengthens B. W. Bacon's theory that such a work once formed part of *Hebrews*. It is only reasonable that Jewish Christians should have compiled an account of the spread of their movement as well as of the life of their Master.

In the present volume the author does not proceed so far as the attempted reconstruction of the lost gospel. His studies are preliminary to that end, and consist mainly of a critical translation of the text of the *Toldoth Jeshu* and a series of investigations into its relations with early

canonical and extra-canonical, patristic, rabbinical, and even Islamic literature. He has brought to his task both the learning and skill that marked his *History of Jewish Christianity,* the most authoritative book on the subject.

The second book is described as the translation of about an eighth of the complete MSS—Aramaic in the Vatican Library and Slav in the Habsburg Royal Library (Vienna)—brought back from the Far East by persecuted Nestorian priests in the thirteenth century. A critical edition of the whole text is promised, and it may then be possible to assign its place in the Corpus of Christian Apocryphal Literature. Meantime we are not disposed to concede the claim of the editor that in contrast with our "deformed and falsified" *N.T.* we have here "the pure original words of Jesus". Rather it appears to be a piece of Ebionite Essene propaganda (the secret of goodness is in the use of Mother Earth's three angels of air, water, and sunlight, and the avoidance of flesh and all cooked food), and much of it is extremely coarse.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

De Veritate. By EDWARD LORD HERBERT OF CHERBURY. Translated with an Introduction by M. H. CARRÉ, M.A. University of Bristol (Arrowsmith). 12s. 6d.

Bristol University has reason to be proud of this translation of an important work by an English philosopher, which, originally written in Latin, has waited too long before appearing in native dress. There was an imperfect French translation by Mersenne in 1639, of the first edition, published in 1624: the present English translation is made from the fuller edition of 1645; it both corrects Mersenne and contains the additional passages. The accompanying Introduction is excellent.

Lord Herbert is generally known as the father of English Deism. Every history of the philosophy of religion contains a reference to his five Common Notions, which he took to be the fundamental points of all religion, impressed by God Himself upon the mind of man, and testified to by the universal consent of mankind. They included, as is well known, the existence of God; the duties of His worship, of piety and virtue, and of repentance for sin; together with the expectation of rewards and punishments after death.

Mr. Carré shows that Herbert's doctrine of religion is but a very small part of his treatise, the real concern of which is a general doctrine of knowledge. In Herbert the old and the new meet together. He belongs to the Renaissance so far as his general idea of nature is animistic: he regards man as the microcosm who is naturally in harmony with the macrocosm of the universe and to whom knowledge of the external world comes naturally by a sympathy with and adaptation to it. But, on the other hand, Herbert is in touch with the new science, and it is his endeavour to describe the process of knowledge with scientific accuracy. Human knowledge is a complex thing, which is brought about through the co-operation of different factors, each important in its place. There is first the object; then the mode in which it manifests itself or appears to us, exhibiting its different aspects in various ways; then comes the concept which we form subjectively by putting together the various qualities which the object has revealed to us through the corresponding faculty: finally, the concept is delivered from subjectivity and becomes objective knowledge by being brought under the review of the Common Notions which form the ultimate court of appeal in matters of truth and reality. All this sounds like a first sketch of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason,* and moves indeed in that direction, without, however, attaining to Kant's sharpness of definition: all outlines are softened by the mystical

atmosphere of the Renaissance Neo-Platonism, with its underlying notion of a deep harmony between man and the universe. But after all it was just in this direction that the later idealism of Schelling and Hegel developed the Kantian epistemology. Mr. Carré, admitting that Herbert's analysis is often confused and superficial, points out that this does not detract from the merit of his fundamental insight. He sums up on the *De Veritate* as follows :—

> In its central conception of the organic relation between the impulse of Nature and human thought, in the theory of the reciprocity between objects and the understanding, and in its discussions of the *a priori* foundations of knowledge, it expresses philosophical ideas which look beyond the whole course of English empiricism, by which for nearly two centuries they were submerged.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Traditional Formal Logic—A Short Account for Students. By W. A. SINCLAIR, M.A. Methuen. 4s. 6d.

This book contains very much the gist of what fifty years ago used to be acquired from the well-known *Elementary Lessons in Logic* by Jevons. It is written with the idea that the student by use of it should prepare himself in the straightforward doctrine of Traditional Logic, so as to leave to lecturers and tutors time and opportunity for discussing more advanced logical questions. The work admirably answers the purpose for which it is designed. It is clear and concise, and the illustrations are excellent. It is particularly good in its treatment of the elliptical forms of common speech, where it shows how they are to be turned into proper logical form. Even practised hands might have a little difficulty in dealing with such a statement as "ticket-holders only"; but it comes out quite neatly as a Universal Negative proposition in the form, "No persons other than ticket-holders are persons who will be admitted".

There is an account of propositions, immediate and mediate inference, division and definition. The book ought to be very useful.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Qurān, translated, with a critical rearrangement of the Surahs, by Richard Bell, D.D. Vol. I, Surahs I-XXIV. Clark. 12s. 6d.

This is a very welcome book. It is a great boon to have a new translation of the *Qurān* made by one of Dr. Bell's learning and competency. But this book is far more than a new translation. It is a pioneer attempt to elucidate the *Qurān* by the methods of Higher Criticism. The *Qurān,* as it stands, gives no clear impression of the development of Muhammad's teaching. Its *Surahs* are arranged not chronologically but according to their length, the longest coming first. Rodwell, in his well-known translation, gave some help by arranging the *Surahs* in what he regarded as their historical order. But even so the confusion was not removed, for, as anyone trained in the methods of Higher Criticism could surmise, the *Surahs* were themselves composite.

Dr. Bell assumes that "the *Qurān* was in written form when the redactors started their work", and he believes that the *Qurān* was in its original form written by Muhammad himself.

> All the possibilities of confusion in written documents have had to be considered—corrections, interlinear additions, additions on the margin, deletions and substitutions, pieces cut off from a passage and wrongly placed, passages written on the back of others and then read continuously, front and back following each other. It is to this, rather

than to textual defects, or to confusion in Muhammad's own thought and style that the dreary welter of the *Qurān* so often deplored by Western writers is due. It arises also from the fact that the *Qurān* was delivered for the most part in short pieces, which were afterwards put together in surahs—again I incline to believe by Muhammad himself, to some extent at least—so that one finds the most diverse subjects treated of in the same surah, just as they forced themselves upon the prophet's attention.

By an ingenious method of printing, Dr. Bell indicates what he holds to be the various strata of each *surah,* and by giving headlines to each section indicates not only its contents but its probable occasion. He modestly states:

> In some cases the author would be the first to admit uncertainty, but he hopes that examination will disclose a sufficient number of certain results to justify the methods which he has adopted, and that he will be given credit in other cases for having made an honest effort to understand the passage as it stands before resorting to hazardous reconstructions.

In such studies, as Dr. Bell indicates, there can be no finality. But this book makes the *Qurān* immensely more intelligible, and we hope that the second half of the work will soon be published.

SYDNEY CAVE.

The Invasion of China by the Western World. By E. R. HUGHES, M.A. Black. 15s.

At the moment, all thought is dominated by the Japanese invasion of China. Yet it may emerge that the subject of this book is the more significant and future-determining event. The full story of the mingling of the cultural streams of China and the West, in so far as it ever can be recorded, awaits perhaps a Chinese pen. But it is unlikely that a more scholarly, well-documented and impartial study can be achieved by a non-Chinese than this of the Rev. E. R. Hughes (with the collaboration of his wife).

An opening chapter, in a rapid historical survey, expounds the thesis that

> during nearly 2,000 years from the 5th century B.C. to the 16th century A.D., Europe and China were reaching out to find each other and did actually meet for purposes of trade, yet under conditions which militated against the interchange of ideas. The arrival of the Jesuits in Peking in 1601 marks the beginning of the modern period when cultural influences as well as trade began to find their way.

Then follow chapters on "The Influence of Missions" (". . . the earliest . . . the largest . . . but whether the profoundest or the most successful is another question"); "Western Political Thought"; "Destruction of the Old Education"; "Western Science and Medicine"; "The New Literature"; closing with a realistic review of "China To-day", where an urban-minded class

> holds the West in fee, rejecting some of its features, welcoming others, and where it welcomes, not hesitating to transform to suit its own taste and its own distinctive judgments of moral and æsthetic values.

Not least of the important contributions of this book is the evidence adduced to show that the two cultures are not alien planes without any common points of reference. Thus, in the matter of science, Mr. Hughes points out that the impulse to analyse and synthesize the universe on a rational basis has not been without its Chinese counterpart to the Greek.

The apparent gulf between China and the West in this regard is due rather to adventitious circumstances in the XVII—XIX centuries in China than to alleged fundamental differences of mentality; though, as the author admits there are eminent Chinese writers who would disagree.

This book will receive a warm welcome from all who are interested in the intercourse of China and the West; and no less, we believe, from Chinese themselves, when the Japanese Major-Generals depart, than from Westerners. In a better ordered world it would be made a required subject for all passport applicants intending residence—for whatever purpose—in China.

H. G. Newsham.

SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST.

*(Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading.)*

We warmly commend to all who desire to understand recent criticism of the Gospels the Rev. Alan Richardson's excellent little book, **The Gospels in the Making* (S.C.M., 5s.). Mr. Richardson has a decided gift of exposition, and this account of a complex and complicated subject is amazingly clear. The recent work of Form Critics on the Continent, and of Streeter, Dodd, Vincent Taylor, Lightfoot, and Rawlinson in this country is made plain so that he who runs may read. Only in the last two or three pages when Mr. Richardson becomes homiletical did we feel that he fell below a very high level.

The skill with which the "Speaker's Bible" is edited by the Rev. E. Hastings calls for continual admiration, and is evidence that the editorial gift is transmissible. The illustrations in the latest volume, *Romans II* (Aberdeen: Speaker's Bible Office, 9s. 6d.), are drawn from recent as well as older literature, and are worked in very aptly. The articles contributed by such experienced expositors as Dr. A. Herbert Gray and the Rev. J. S. Stewart are a valuable addition.

The Bishop of London's Lenten Book is this year written by Dr. Horace Crotty, for many years a Bishop in Australia. Its title is *The Church Victorious* (Longmans, 2s. 6d.); it is a healthy, invigorating discussion of the function of the Church in the modern world, from which Free Churchmen as well as Anglicans can derive inspiration. One sentence may serve as a sample.

> We need a Christianity, also, less concerned with querulous railings against what it too loosely and violently describes as secularism, and more concerned with eradicating that other secularism which is poisoning the Church's own heart and life. For it is this secularism, which flourishes within the Church itself, which foredooms our Christianity to sure defeat, whenever leadership, in significant tracts of life, is called in question between it and the State.

There are those who contend that sacraments belong to the childhood of man, and that as man learns more of God and His ways they will become unnecessary. The persistence of superstition—and nobody denies that superstitious notions have never been altogether purged away from the sacraments—suggests to some that a root and branch reformation is necessary, and the Church should abolish entirely the use of outward symbols. We doubt whether that is possible, even if it were wise. Our contention is that while the use of sacraments should not be imposed on Christians who feel them to be no help, but rather a hindrance, to communion with God, those who value them should continue to cherish their use. The most

ardent non-sacramentarian cannot read a beautiful book like Miss Evelyn Underhill's **The Mystery of Sacrifice* (Longmans, 2s. 6d.) without being moved, and without realizing how central is the place of the Eucharist in the life, faith, and worship of many believers. There are sentences here and there at which Free Churchmen will shudder ("Awful words are said. A bell rings. A miracle is accomplished. . .") because of their magical implications; they will nevertheless be profoundly impressed by the glowing intensity of Miss Underhill's exposition of the eucharistic liturgy. We plead again with Congregationalists, and with all Christians, to recognize wholeheartedly both the reality of sacramental religion and the fact that many equally devout followers of Christ Jesus do not find the use of special sacraments a help in their spiritual lives. In the Church of the Christ that made men free we believe there is room for both.

The Rev. F. H. Amphlett Micklewright's **Catholicism and the Need for Revolution* (Centenary Press, 5s.) proved a much better book than appeared likely in its early pages, where Schmiedel was misspelt, and a travesty of the Methodist movement was given—the author evidently thinks Wesley was a Calvinist. Although the book is strangely uneven, often irritating in its anti-Protestantism, it is nevertheless well worth reading for the stimulus it gives to thought. In his main contention, that the only religion worth while is "a religion which seeks to deal with all the problems of God, man, and society", Mr. Micklewright is absolutely sound, and his comparison between Christianity and Communism is on the spot. He puts the case for sacraments very well, but it is never clear how belief in the sacramental view of all life suddenly changes into insistence on the centrality of two sacraments only.

The three features which mark *The Salvation of Modern Man* (Centenary Press, 5s.) mark all that the Rev. W. G. Peck has written since he left Methodism for Anglo-Catholicism. They are:

1. A running style that always reminds us of the type of woman who seems as if she will never stop talking: his sentences never pull up sharp; smoothly they run on, and sometimes one wonders whether they mean anything at all.

2. An antagonism to the present economic system running to such absurd lengths as

> The life of the modern man oscillates between the two perils of death by starvation in his own street, and death by bullets or poison gas in the trenches.

3. A fanatical obsession with sacramentalism, now developing into "a philosophy of Christian totalitarianism founded on the sacramental principle". One finds the word on almost every page. If it be thought that this merely means that Mr. Peck believes all life is sacramental, that is to make a huge mistake; to say

> a happy meal in a Christian home is just as much the Sacrament of Our Lord's institution as is the Holy Eucharist celebrated at the Church's altar [is to fail] to understand that in a fallen world the restored and fully sacramental treatment of the natural can be undertaken only by the redeemed Society, acting as such, with that specific intention. . . It is her Eucharistic communion alone which is integrated with the fellowship of the Heavenly City.

And what are we to make of this?:

> For if God is one person and only one person, or no more than an undifferentiated unity, to introduce Him to another person, albeit

human and finite, is to engage God Himself in an experience for which there is no ground in His own Being. But if God is more than a person, if He is Blessed Trinity, the solitary man alone with Him is facing a Reality, between Whom and himself there is no such likeness as can constitute a ground of communion.

Nothing of "Man made into the image of God", or "Now we are sons of God".

Vladimir Solovyev (1853-1900) left the Orthodox Church at 14, returned to it at 20, became a professor at 21—his first lecture beginning, "In every sphere of his activity, and above all else, man dreams of freedom"—was soon obliged to leave Russia, and joined the Roman Catholic Church in 1906. He wrote many philosophical and theological works, but his *War, Progress, and Human History* is perhaps the work which is best known in England. Mr. Donald Attwater has done well to translate *Religioznya Osnovy Zhisni* under the title *God, Man and the Church* (Clarke, 5s.), written over 50 years ago. Its spirit attracts the reader, and, while there is something characteristically Russian about it, there is a power of logical argument not always found in Russian writers. The chapter on "Prayer", a fruitful and suggestive study of the Lord's Prayer, is well worth reading. As typical of Solovyev's style and treatment we may quote :

> We are made holy by the holiness of the Church, but she is unsoiled by our sins, for her holiness does not come from us but from God by Christ ; she is not in us, though she is made up of us (just as the body does not get its essential character from tissues and bone, *etc.,* which nevertheless compose it). Nor is the Church only an assemblage of believing men : she is, before all else, *that which brings and holds them together,* an essential form of union given from on high which makes men participants in the Godhead.

And even when we recoil from his teaching, as often we must, we cannot but be impressed by the manner of its presentation. Thus :

> The human society which has an hierarchical succession authentically deriving from Christ, which holds the true faith, and has true sacraments, requires nothing else in order to be the Church, while a society which lacks any one of these cannot be : this follows from their close reciprocal relation in virtue of which the absence of one prevents the real existence of the others. For example, default in hierarchical succession from Christ leaves a society without a legitimate administrative body and without order in its ecclesiastical acts ; but it does more : it deprives the sacraments administered by its clergy of divine grace and, its life being wanting in this essential communication with the Godhead, the profession of faith is reduced to an abstract and dead formula. The essence of the Church as God's kingdom is, then, determined by the indissoluble union of these three elements, and we have now to look for the expression of its divineness.

We hope that Protestants will make a point of reading Dr. J. C. Heenan's *Priest and Penitent* (Sheed & Ward, 7s. 6d.), "A Discussion of Confession" written "for the use of the penitent". They will learn what it is that the Roman Catholic Church tries to do through the Confessional system, and the method by which that system works, and will without doubt profit by that Church's long experience in dealing with souls. The book is a strange mixture, sometimes compelling admiration by its wisdom, at others consternation by its credulity. What *is* one to make of arguments such as the following?

> Everything is good in itself. Whatever is created is perfect in its own order or category. This statement may be questioned by one who has seen a deformed baby. Surely in this case the Creator is responsible for an evil and cruel thing? The answer is that God did not create the body of any baby. The only bodies he created were, so far as we know, perfect. They were endowed with gifts beyond their nature. Adam and Eve were the only people who received their bodies, so to say, directly from His Hands. Deformity could probably be traced in every case to some avoidable cause.

Nurses of all Churches and none could learn much from a Roman Catholic work, Mother Catherine de Jésus-Christ's *At the Bedside of the Sick* (Burns, Oates, 5s.). From its "precepts and counsels" they will gain a sense of the dignity, glory, and opportunity of their calling. Of course, non-Romans will sometimes be offended as they read, as when they learn that a nurse must not herself ask the services of the minister of a non-Roman patient when he desires one, but get one of his relatives to do so, and must not, without a "very grave cause", attend a cremation. And the bogs into which sacramentarian superstition leads may be gathered from this paragraph:

> An unformed embryo must be baptised by immersion in tepid water. Open the membranes—for the baptism to be valid the water must touch the human being directly—then immerse it and remove it from the water, saying the words, "If thou art alive, *etc.*".

Congregationalism has no leaving examination for theological students, but it would be an interesting experiment to place in their hands *The Ancient History of the God Jesus* (Watts, 5s.), in which Mr. A. B. Sanders presents an abridged English translation of Edouard Dujardin's work. How many of them, before entering the ministry, could reply adequately to the contention that Jesus was the god of a prehistoric mystery religion of Palestine, with its most important rites Baptism, a Communion Feast in which the faithful ate in symbolic form the body of the God, and an Expiatory Sacrifice: "Like all ancient gods Jesus was originally a sacrificed God". How would they deal with the statement

> there is no trace in St. Paul of the hearings, of the conviction, and of the judicial execution. On the contrary, we find throughout the idea of an expiatory sacrifice.

This version is a clear statement of a point of view which, it is to be feared, Christians today are quite unequipped to face.

The Rev. Geoffrey Allen's *The Courage to be Real* (MacLehose, 5s.) is a difficult book to describe. Its message is said to be "Grace makes truth a possibility", or in Brunner's words, "the Christian does not build Christian bridges but strong bridges", and its chapters are Grace and Truth, The Kingdom, Growth, Fear, The Love of Money, The Crowd Evangelism, Missions, God. Most of the chapters have something worthwhile in them, but the last two are easily the best, in part because there is no mention of sex, which somehow intrudes in almost all the others, and mainly because Mr. Allen draws on his recent experience as Lecturer in China. We do not like references to the "brilliant insight" of Jesus.

There are some useful essays in *The Recall to Religion* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 8s. 6d.), which the Archbishop of Canterbury introduces. After the Archbishop of York's survey of the problem we have the Bishop of Bristol's "The Causes of Decline"; the Dean of Exeter's "The Necessity of Religion in All Ages and Races" (which has to be far too thinly spread to be of much service); Miss Phyllis Dent's timely and helpful "The Teaching of

Religion by Parents"; the Headmaster of Westminster's "The Teaching of Religion in Schools"; the Rev. Charles Smyth's "The Importance of Church Attendance" (disproportionately long); the Rev. V. A. Demant's "Religion and the State"; the Bishop of Lichfield's "Religion and Morality"; Mr. John Newson's admirable "The Christian Purpose in Social Work"; Prof. A. E. Taylor's "Religion and Present Day Thought"; and the Bishop of Bradford's "The Challenge to Religion". The Editor might have controlled his contributors better, corrected their spelling, and also (we think) their attribution of quotations. If the essays say nothing which has not been said before, they bring into focus the problems facing organized religion today.

Dr. Greta Hort's *Piers Plowman and Contemporary Religious Thought* (S.P.C.K., 8s. 6d.) will give delight to the scholar, be he student of history, literature, or theology. From beginning to end it gives one confidence, and makes one feel that the writer "knows her stuff". The chapter in which she shows that Langland gets most of his Bible quotations *via* Breviary or Missal is masterly, but not less so than such a chapter as that on the Sacrament of Penance. The book will be indispensable to all students of *Piers*. The absence of an Index is an unexpected fall from grace.

Simon Patrick said of John Smith:

> I never got so much good among all my books by a whole day's plodding in a study, as by an hour's discourse I have got with him. For he was not a library locked up, nor a book clasped, but he stood open for any to converse withal that had a mind to learn. Yea, he was a fountain running over, labouring to do good to those who perhaps had no mind to receive it.

What applies to Smith applies in some measure to all the Cambridge Platonists, and all who have refreshed themselves in their pages will open Prof. W. C. de Pauley's *The Candle of the Lord* (S.P.C.K., 7s. 6d.) with eager anticipation. Dr. de Pauley includes with the Cambridge Platonists Cumberland, Culverwel (a "Christian Aristotelian"), George Rust, and Stillingfleet. Students of the deistic controversy would be well advised to read these studies with care.

In the "Challenge Series" (Clarke, 1s. each) we have a reprint of Dr. John Baillie's *The Roots of Religion in the Human Soul,* first published in 1926; four papers by Modern Free Churchmen—the Revs. G. Currie Martin ("The Bible"), T. Wigley ("God"), K. A. Saunders ("Jesus"), and Dr. Rhondda Williams ("Man"—three names wrongly spelt need correction); and Prof. Karl Barth's *The Church and the Churches,* which fails to make clear what it is that the writer wants the Churches to do.

Seventeen out of 88 pages of Dr. John Lewis's *Introduction to Philosophy* (Gollancz, 1s. 6d. & 1s.) are given to Hegel and Dialectical Materialism, which will perhaps serve to indicate both the viewpoint of the writer and the weakness of a book which makes a brave attempt at an impossible task.

That They Go Forward (S.C.M., 2s.) is an Impression of the Oxford Conference on Church, Community and State written by the Rev. Eric Fenn with young people specially in mind.

The rest of the Conference volumes have now been issued. Volumes II-VII are obtainable at the price of 30s. for the set (Allen & Unwin). Volume II, *The Christian Understanding of Man* (8s. 6d.), contains contributions by Profs. T. E. Jessop ("The Scientific Account of Man"), R. L. Calhoun ("The Dilemma of Humanitarian Modernism"), and V. Alexeiev ("The Marxist Anthropology and the Christian Conception of Man"), and shorter

papers on "The Christian Understanding of Man" by Profs. Emil Brunner, W. M. Horton, the Rev. Austin Farrer, and Pastor Pierre Maury.

Volume III, *The Kingdom of God in History* (7s. 6d.), contains seven papers on that subject—Prof. Otto Piper's name in the list of contributors is apparently a mistake. There is a good deal of overlapping, and some of the papers, notably those of Profs. Paul Tillich and H. D. Wendland, are by no means milk for babes, but any minister or layman who would work through the papers would learn much. The other contributors are Dr. H. G. Wood, Prof. C. H. Dodd, Dr. Edwyn Bevan (exceptionally thought-provoking), Prof. E. W. Lyman, and Mr. Christopher Dawson.

The contributors to Vol. IV, *Christian Faith and the Common Life,* are the Archbishop of York and Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr, whose essays bear the title of the book, Dr. Martin Dibelius ("The Message of the *N.T.* and the Orders of Human Society"), Prof. Werner Wiesner ("The Law of Nature and Social Institutions"), Dr. H. H. Farmer ("The Revelation in Christ and the Christian's Vocation"), and Prof. J. C. Bennett ("The Causes of Social Evil"). Dr. Nils Ehrenström writes the Introduction. We cannot but be struck by the prominence in the Continental essays of the conception of "orders" made familiar by Brunner.

Vol. V, *Church and Community* (8s. 6d.), contains some intensely interesting contributions. It is good to have Dr. K. S. Latourette reminding us of the "abounding vigour" and "increased vitality" of organized Christianity during the last 150 years, and to read Dr. Ernest Barker's insistence on the "incalculable debt" owing to the Free Churches from the 17th century onwards. Dr. H. Paul Douglass's survey of Church life in America is packed with information and suggestion, and should inspire some student to a parallel survey for England. The other writers in the volume are Dr. Marc Boegner, Dr. Hanns Lilje, Dr. Manfred Björkquist, Dr. Stefan Zankov, and Dr. E. E. Aubrey. There is something fascinating about these varying views from France, Germany, Sweden, Russia, and America.

Vol. VI deals with *Church, Community and State in relation to Education* (7s. 6d.). Profs. Fred Clarke, W. Zenkovsky, Paul Monroe, and Mr. C. R. Morris write on "The Crisis of Education", and Mr. J. W. D. Smith, Dr. Kohnstamm, Dr. J. H. Oldham, and "X" (a striking contribution) on "The Crisis in Christian Education".

In Vol. VII, *The Universal Church and the World of Nations* (8s. 6d.), after Lord Lothian has described "The Demonic Influence of National Sovereignty", Sir Alfred Zimmern, in an article with frequent depreciatory references to the Churches, says it is "not a little unhelpful, and more than a little old-fashioned, to fix on 'sovereignty' as the root-cause of the troubled condition of inter-state relations". Other articles are Dr. Gablentz's "The Material Foundations of an International Order", Dr. Max Huber's "The Christian Understanding of Law", Mr. J. F. Dulles's "The Problem of Peace in a Dynamic World", the Rev. V. A. Demant's "The Tragedy of War and the Hope of Peace", the Rev. Wilhelm Menn's "The Church of Christ and the International Order"; Prof. Otto Piper's "War and Christian Peace-Making" is both suggestive and surprising, and Canon Raven concludes with "The Religious Basis of Pacifism". There are misprints on pp. 236 and 301.

Readers are advised to skip the Preface of Dr. C. R. Watson's *What Is This Moslem World?* (S.C.M., 5s.), for it may deter them from reading an exceptionally informing book. Dr. Watson surveys far-flung Islam, appraises its teaching and its practices, and then discusses its contacts with Christianity, where the section dealing with the Crusades is specially good.

The outline of the Christian Missionary movement, with its almost complete failure in regard to Islam, precedes an examination of future prospects. Dr. Watson shows how the Moslem sees Christianity through the foreigner, the film, travel (cabarets and boulevards and Broadway give them their impressions of Christianity and Christian civilization), and politics. No wonder they don't become Christian!

The Rev. Ronald Rees's *China Faces the Storm* (Livingstone Press, 2s.) will receive a special welcome at the present time. It is packed with information, so much so that in some places it is difficult to see the wood for the trees, and it contains unhappy sentences like that about the unfortunate young man who "has a most perfect English accent acquired at Cambridge". But these are small blemishes in an account by one well qualified and well situated to judge of the present state of Christianity in China. Mr. Rees tells of the leading figures in Chinese life from Chiang Kai-Shek downwards and shows how the disturbed condition of the country has affected all branches of missionary enterprise. A visitor put these important questions, "Are Chinese Christians really different from non-Christians? If so, in what respect; and what is your evidence?"; Mr. Rees pointedly asks what kind of reply British Christians would give to a similar query. Are our Christian politicians markedly different from non-Christians? Are the members of the average Christian congregation full of the spirit of fellowship? He emphasizes the need for a much larger use of lay men and women, and outlines a scheme of lay-training (short schools and institutions of two weeks' duration for lay folk with qualities of leadership), from which British Congregationalists could learn. He shows the influence of Christian lives, as, for example:

> I once ventured to ask him how he came to join the Church. He said that at the Christian school in Soochow where he was educated the man who had a decisive influence over him was the director of athletics, who did not deliver many addresses but who lived and did his job in such an attractive way that he wanted also to be like that, a follower of Christ.

The intense earnestness and glowing sincerity of Mr. C. F. Andrews carry us over a good many repetitions in *India and the Pacific* (Allen & Unwin, 6s. & 3s. 6d.), though we rub our eyes when he becomes a military strategist, advocating Fiji as the naval and air base of the future. Mr. Andrews paid a visit—his third—to Fiji recently owing to a suggestion that members of the Legislative Council be nominated by the Governor rather than elected. He emphasizes that young India would regard this action as yet another British betrayal, and that therefore it is of supreme importance that promises made—to Indians and to Fijians—should not be broken. Mr. Andrews's study of Fiji (which now has 85,000 Indians against 97,000 Fijians) is full of significant points, while his survey of the 2,500,000 dispersed Indians is as interesting as his examination of the relationships of India, Australia, New Zealand, and Japan.

New Morals for Old (Longmans, 3s. 6d.), a short and on the whole a sensible book by the Rev. V. A. Holmes-Gore, is introduced by the Bishop of Liverpool. It is a defence of the Christian idea of marriage; while more constructive and tolerant than some contributions by Christians to this important subject, on some of the questions raised it is well in the rear of medical science.

In his title *The Criminals We Deserve* (Methuen, 7s. 6d.) Mr. H. F. T. Rhodes, formerly in the Laboratory of Technical Police, uses Lacassagne's words, "Societies get the criminals they deserve". Mr. Rhodes surveys

"Some Aspects of Crime in the Modern World" — examining murder, forgery, gangsterdom, arson, traffic in women. He shows how overcrowding and unemployment produce crime; juvenile crime is on the increase, the criminal has improved his methods, and resource and adaptation are needed to tackle the changed situation, for

> It is safe to say that this superior type of lawbreaker is increasing and will go on increasing in our modern society.

The conclusion of Mr. Calvin B. Hoover's *Dictators and Democracy* (Macmillan, 6s.) is much the same as that of his compatriot, Mr. E. B. Ashton, in *The Fascist. His State and His Mind,* on which we commented last quarter. After examining the 20 years of Totalitarianism in Russia, Germany and Italy, with its economic results and its attitude to property, Mr. Hoover asks whether "the totalitarian tide is at ebb or flood?". His discussion is in some ways already out of date, as he wrote before the recession of trade in the United States and Japan's aggression on China, while he concluded that Britain would have to decide not only *whether* to fight Italy but *when* to fight before the end of 1937. On that decision rests the future of totalitarianism. International opinion was "appalled at the complete collapse of British resistance in the face of unexpected Italian truculence" (there is no mention of the refusal of the United States to join an oil embargo), and is now looking to see what Britain proposes to do, for

> the possibility of the resistance of Western Europe to the spread of the totalitarian state system depends upon the *rôle* of Great Britain. . . . War with Italy is inevitable unless the British are willing to withdraw from the Mediterranean without resistance. . . . If the British decide to resist, a general European war can be expected within a very short time.

Whether the war break out in the Mediterranean or the Far East, it will involve all Europe, and it would be a question whether revolution in Germany and Italy would occur before a military decision was reached or parliamentary government in France and England would survive the strain. Mr. Hoover is almost as doleful a prophet as Jeremiah. The one thing he fails to do is to suggest any contribution his own country can make to the world's peace.

Unholy Pilgrimage (Clark, 5s.), by the Rev. T. L. Harris, an English-born American clergyman and liturgiologist, is a much better book than at first it seemed likely to be. A discouraging straining after smartness was soon lost in a vivid account of a visit to Russia undertaken to discover how people live without God. While recognizing the problem presented by the continued judicial murders, Mr. Harris's experience was "disquieting to a Christian conscience". He found goodness, but not holiness (there were no saints; does he find them in America, we wonder?), "admirable consistency in men's lives" he has met nowhere outside a monastery, and everywhere "the breath of life". He made friends with Russian children on a Volga boat and was greatly impressed, saw how Russian factories made men as well as material because they were organically related to the community, and realized the power of the cult of heroes and of the sense of belonging to a party with a purpose. He was distressed by the hatred of the churches, yet felt it was deserved because of the Church's hypocrisy and corruption, and he recognizes that

> culturally the distinctive feature of Soviet civilization is its deliberate, conscientious atheism.

Nevertheless in the churches found open one-third of those present were young people, drawn there often by a feeling of dissatisfaction with life.

There is no sense of sin, and no desire for immortality; as a dying young man said to Mr. Harris, "It has been good to make a better world for our children". Altogether a striking book which ought to be read, though with a critical faculty. We wonder, for example, if the Russians are as inefficient as is suggested (have not Russian planes outclassed German in Spain?).

Another book by an American, this time a Congregationalist, is Dr. M. Spinka's *Christianity Confronts Communism* (Gifford, 7s. 6d.), and it is interesting to compare the two. Dr. Spinka has not Mr. Harris's vividness of style nor is his material so up-to-date. Nor is he so sympathetic to Russian communism, witness the exclamation marks which pepper his 200 pages (there must be 100 of them). He does, however, provide a useful sketch of the Revolution, and an addendum to his book, *The Church and the Russian Revolution* (he is not always consistent, for having emphasized the fact that the sects were tolerated he subsequently says that all Christians were treated alike). Having outlined Marxism he comes to his two final chapters, the best in the book—"Why Does Communism Reject all Religion?" and "Christianity Confronts Communism". Delivered to a popular audience in Chicago, these lectures form a helpful introduction to a big subject.

We recommend all students of the relation of Christianity to war to read the Rev. Humphry Beevor's *Peace and Pacifism* (Centenary Press, 5s.). It is an uneven work, sometimes clear, forceful, and radical, at others vague and almost obscurantist in the acceptance of dogmas without examination ("a religious movement cannot exist without making its appeal to dogma"). A study of the Gospels leads Mr. Beevor to conclude that *"doctrinaire"* Pacifism gains no support from the teaching and example of our Lord. There are certain occasions when it is not merely lawful, but right and a matter of duty, for Christians to use force; and this use of force may on some occasions take the form of the employment of a military organization. Nevertheless in His death on the Cross Jesus "emphasized the futility of violence as a means of combating (Mr. Beevor's spelling) the powers of evil". Mr. Beevor brings together these conclusions in discussing the Christian's duty both when war is imminent and in a world ruled by an economic system which leads to war. Not least cogent are some pages dealing with the witness of the Church today: the failure of the Archbishop of Canterbury's "recall to religion" is due to the fact that the world

> is still unconvinced that the Church has any real intention of preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ and of demonstrating its implications in the 20th century... In an age which needs the clear and simple expounding of the gospel, the leaders of the Church are enmeshing themselves more and more in the network of ecclesiastical machinery, and are occupying themselves with attempts to "tidy up" the internal organization of their flock, and to hamper with an unimaginative demand for uniformity their most effective evangelists, instead of seeking to arrest the spread of national religious indifference by a challenging demand for the reform of national life, domestic, social, and political.

In *War Can Be Averted* (Gollancz, 5s.) Miss Eleanor Rathbone has written a forceful, even a hearty, book. The way war can be averted is not pacifism, the various forms of which Miss Rathbone subjects to a searching analysis, but "collective resistance to aggression accompanied by removal of reasonable grievances by peaceful negotiation". The declaration Miss Rathbone expounds is signed by Mr. Churchill and Mr.

Lloyd George, as well as the Archbishop of Canterbury and Lord Cecil, Dr. Dalton and Mr. Noel Baker. It is a strange assortment of bed-fellows, and we do not find anywhere a disposition to trust the country's affairs to the two first-named statesmen, though periodically it is rumoured that a place in the Government is to be found for Mr. Churchill. The extract in "Worth Noting" shows Miss Rathbone's challenge to pacifism.

Those who have not yet realized what war is should read *Bombs on China* (Livingstone Press, 3d.), letters written from Shanghai by doctors and other missionaries of the L.M.S.

Mr. Christopher Lloyd's *Democracy and Its Rivals* (Longmans, 3s. 6d.) is an Introduction to Political Theory which students will find helpful, while the "Essay Questions" at the end will test their knowledge. After examining Nationalism, Imperialism, and Internationalism, Mr. Lloyd expounds the meaning of democracy, and discusses its rivals, Socialism, Communism, and Fascism, and concludes with a section on "The Meaning of History", the least satisfactory part of his book. Dame Ethel Smyth unfortunately becomes a chemical—Ethyl.

We fear we must say that *The Moral Basis of Politics* (Constable, 8s. 6d.), by Mrs. Naomi Mitchison, left us very tired. The arrangement is bad, there is much repetition, and so often Mrs. Mitchison seems—if only she knew it—to be translating the commonplaces of the modern pulpit into a jargon peculiar to herself with the air of being a pioneer. The book, she tells us, has taken two years to write; yet it bears many signs of hurry, not only in the arrangement, but in such phrases as "one person losing their temper", and in Czecho-Slovakia being transferred to the west of Germany (both on the same page). In spite of all this we recommend readers to persevere. The chapter "Dilemmas and Choices" is full of suggestive thinking, and Mrs. Mitchison can put a point cogently; for example, was pacifism ever better stated than here?

> The true pacifist not only believes that means always alter ends, but also he considers that violence is not only an evil, but *a greater evil than anything else.* In this statement two points of view are involved. One is practical: since killing is the only quite certainly and irretrievably irreversible thing which human beings can do to one another, they should not do it, in case, as is highly probable, they find out afterwards that they have made a mistake. The other is moral: if life is the only or main sacred thing, then the taking of human (or perhaps any) life is the supreme sacrilege. As more and more of the things which used to be held sacred turn out not to be, or as their priests turn out to have been deceiving us, so we go back and back in our search for values, until life alone is left as real value.

Mrs. Mitchison probably does not realize how biased she is in regard to religion, and how unscientific in her attitude to the U.S.S.R.; where, for example, is the evidence for the statement that 70 per cent of the citizens of the Soviet Union are now "free to choose the kind of work they want to do, the kind of pattern they want to make with their lives"?

In *Heredity and Politics* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) Mrs. Mitchison's brother, Prof. J. B. S. Haldane, attacks the problem of civilized life from another side. Recognizing that "the biology of human reproduction is a field of which we know singularly little", he gathers together various facts the practical value of which may be increasingly apparent as knowledge grows. On heredity and nurture, sterilization, family allowances, and kindred subjects he has much to say that will be novel to those unfamiliar with the subject; his figures about mental defectives—only 7½ per cent of the

children of a group of mental defectives in Birmingham were themselves defective—will surprise most readers. His case against sterilization is the most convincing we have seen: three ironic notes on a model sterilization law drafted in America are sufficient in themselves to condemn it: the "socially inadequate classes" who are to be sterilized include Blind[1] ([1]*E.g.*, Milton); Deaf[2] ([2]*E.g.*, Beethoven); the homeless[1], tramps[1], and paupers[1] ([1]*E.g.*, Jesus).

A wide range of learning, sound judgment, and Lancastrian shrewdness mark all that Dr. Ernest Barker writes, and we can imagine no lectures more timely and suggestive than the nine which make *The Citizen's Choice* (Cambridge Press, 7s. 6d.). Dr. Barker has the knowledge which enables him to discuss and defend democracy effectively and to criticize totalitarianism without bias or bluster. His keyword is "perspective", and whether he is talking about the teaching of civics, the theories of F. W. Maitland, or the relation of philosophy and politics (a very fine Haldane Memorial Lecture) we are conscious of balance and moderation. The Cambridge University Press surprisingly gives us "creeks" for "creaks" on p. 54.

Dr. E. E. Thomas's *The Political Aspect of Religious Development* (Heritage, 10s. 6d.) is a much better book than its predecessor. Dr. Thomas is fortunate in the possession of a clear style, though we do not like "structures" as a verb; it is used many times: "structure" is perhaps the key-idea of the book. We say "perhaps", for while the chapters, taken singly, are understandable, the aim and arrangement are baffling. "To show that religion is life, and life is religion" is what the author tries to do, but the relevance of some of the chapters, noticeably those which set out to prove that all the scriptures depend on history, "the highest and most comprehensive branch of knowledge", is not evident. It is by his provocativeness and by his readiness to examine generally accepted ideas that Dr. Thomas renders his best service. He tells us, for example, that selfishness is necessary today, for it is "the only means of safety and security", and that "religion must recreate itself in the light of new ideals and larger aspirations". At other times he produces a familiar idea as if it were a new discovery, as that Christianity undermined the Roman Empire.

Mr. T. Lyon's able essay, **The Theory of Religious Liberty in England, 1603-1639* (Cambridge Press, 7s. 6d.), raises so many timely questions of concern to Free Churchmen that we wish we had many pages in which we could discuss them. Although his period is restricted, Mr. Lyon has to cover a wide field, which includes Puritans, Separatists, and Baptists, Anglican and sceptical Latitudinarians, and Roman Catholics. Nevertheless he would have done well to provide more background, to draw attention to L'Hôpital and other continentals, to cite Melville's words about King James as God's "silly vassal", and to investigate the Puritans and Independents of the last thirty years of Elizabeth's reign. Such allusions as he makes to Elizabeth's time are disquieting in that they suggest reliance on secondary rather than primary authorities; the attribution of "scurrility" to Martin Marprelate seems secondhand rather than the result of a reading of the tracts. The distinction which Mr. Lyon draws between Independents and Barrowists will not always be clear even to modern Independents, but he renders great service in showing that within the ranks of the Independents there were many shades of opinion, and that the views of John Robinson as well as of John Smyth changed from time to time. In the *Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society* we hope to examine Mr. Lyon's book at greater length. It deserves a warm welcome and should do much to set readers thinking and to start them researching.

It is possible that the re-emergence of the question of the relationship of Church and State is responsible for the attention now being paid to the history of Dissent. It is pleasing to handle so competent a book as Mr. Anthony Lincoln's *Some Political and Social Ideas of English Dissent, 1763-1800* (Cambridge Press, 8s. 6d.), though we wish his title had not been so misleading; his concern is with "Rational Dissent", that of Price and Priestley in particular, and not with Dissent in general. His major interest, too, is political and not religious; we noted that he quotes even Neal at second-hand, and though he uses Dr. McLachlan's work regularly he always spells his name wrongly. That said, however, we have nothing but praise for an essay which is an examination of Hazlitt's dictum, "The old Dissenters indeed, I look upon as the nursing fathers of our liberties". On the attitude of the Dissenters to the American and French Revolutions, on their conception of the relation of the State to religion, on the struggle for the repeal of the Test Act, and especially on their political theory, Mr. Lincoln is extremely fresh and suggestive. That a book on such a subject should win the Prince Consort Prize at Cambridge is encouraging to students of Nonconformist history. We hope Mr. Lincoln will continue his studies: he will find some useful materials in the journals of the denominational historical societies; even that of the Unitarian Society he does not seem to use.

Mr. René Fülöp-Miller's *The Power and Secret of the Papacy* (Longmans, 7s. 6d.) may have Leo XIII for its hero, but the study is really a panegyric on Thomas Aquinas, on whose doctrine and "timeless principle" Leo based his teaching: the Angelic Doctor and his Papal disciple

> boldly set for themselves the task of bringing into accord faith and reason, religious and secular life.

They failed, but Leo tried hard; to Mr. Fülöp-Miller his adroit diplomacy is but

> the practical application of the knowledge that within the world the methods of the world are alone effective, and that only the proper utilization of those methods could bring about that success in the temporal sphere without which an actively functioning Church . . . cannot possibly endure.

Mr. Fülöp-Miller expounds the policy and the encyclicals of the Vatican during the last four Papacies.

The volume ends with an examination of the conflict between the Thomist system—

> the logical and formally complete expression of a philosophy which stands in eternal opposition to the search for knowledge based on man's unaided reason—

and both the rationalism and irrationalism which has succeeded it. An interesting study in which the translator gives us a new word, "thitherto".

Miss M. G. Jones's "Study of 18th century Puritanism in Action", *The Charity School Movement* (Cambridge Press, 21s.), is a credit both to its author and its producers. It deals in a competent fashion with a subject of which even church historians have a vague knowledge only. How many Anglicans are aware of the splendid pioneer work the S.P.C.K. did in Scotland as well as in England ere, the charity school having proved to have dangerous associations with politics, it turned to missionary work abroad and the supply of religious literature at home? Miss Jones, who has assiduously examined the S.P.C.K.'s voluminous MSS., admirably sets out the various types of Charity School, and shows how the happy association with Dissenters in the work broke down with the emergence of High

Anglicanism and the activity of the Jacobites in Anne's reign. Co-operation between Anglicans and Dissenters is also seen in the work of the Welsh Trust, on which Miss Jones is very informing. The chapters on the schools in Scotland, Ireland, and Wales are of great value; here special problems of language and religion arose, and in Ireland efforts were made to meet them by the Charter Schools, which John Howard visited, and of which Miss Jones says:

> In no single department of the schools had the Society's aim been realised: religious, scholastic, industrial, all had failed.

Howard's is but one of the famous names which stud Miss Jones's pages —we have Hannah More and Isaac Watts, Defoe and Johnson, Gibson and Wesley. The Appendixes, with lists of the schools and maps and useful bibliography, help to make the book altogether indispensable to the student of the subject.

Dr. Cecil Roth, whose *Short History of the Jewish People* received a deservedly warm welcome a short time ago, has now, in *The Jewish Contribution to Civilization* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.), made a spirited and well-documented reply to those who say the Jew is merely a middleman who produces nothing. In some ways his task is not difficult, with Isaiah (to say nothing of Jesus and Paul), Spinoza, Mendelssohn, Pissarro ready to hand, but most readers will be surprised to hear of Jewish contributions to exploration and travel, of the Jewish cartographers of Majorca and the possibility that Columbus himself was a Jew. Dr. Roth takes his reader into many fields, in which we discover strange flowers: how many people remember today that the Palgraves were originally Cohens—and Pinero and Sidney Lee were Jews? The marvel is, when we remember the long persecution of the Jews, that they have created anything at all: Dr. Roth shows that their gifts to civilization have been extensive indeed.

No Englishman could have been found with better qualifications to tackle the *United States of America* in the "Modern States" series (Arrowsmith, 3s. 6d.) than Prof. R. B. Mowat. If sometimes there is a little too much "uplift" for the historian, it is nevertheless gratifying to have a writer with ideals, and not ashamed to confess them. This little book makes an admirable survey; it deserved better maps than the end-papers provide.

The manner in which Mr. R. H. Mottram builds up the character and achievements of *Noah* (Rich & Cowan, 5s.) from the Bible and other stories of the Deluge is a fascinating picture of the novelist at work. Bible students will be able to learn a good deal from his reconstruction, and journalists from the way in which he makes a description spin out to a requisite length! It is disturbing, however, to find Mr. Mottram going far out of his way to split an infinitive. And does the General Thanksgiving say what Mr. Mottram makes it say?

Although Mr. Charles Williams does his best he cannot give colour to the life of "the King without a face". At first he tries to do it by smart phrases and tricks of style—a chapter begins "Or rather there was.", and Clarence is "inserted" in the Tower. When he tires of this, his *Henry VII* (Barker, 10s.) becomes a workmanlike study of a King aptly described as the Chairman of a Limited Liability Company, which he is determined to make a success. Henry was an unpleasant person. It is doubtful whether he or his son treated Katherine of Aragon more reprehensibly.

We have some difficulty in deciding for whom Mr. Eric A. Sutton's *The Happy Isles* (Dent, 3s. 6d.) has been written. The illustrations and the style of the first part of the book, an account of the life of Emanuel Swedenborg, suggests that he had young people in mind, but what young people

would make of the second half, with its summaries of Swedenborg's intercourse with angels and the inhabitants of the other planets, we do not know. The story of Swedenborg is not as well-known in this country as it should be, and Mr. Sutton tells it so well that he makes the reader determined to learn more about the scientist and inventor who had a spiritual experience which changed his life in a manner which reminds one of Paul, Augustine, or Wesley.

The forthcoming celebration of the bicentenary of John Wesley's conversion is producing a spate of books on Methodism. Dr. J. E. Rattenbury's *The Conversion of the Wesleys* (Epworth Press, 6s.) is a forceful and able sketch which makes enjoyable reading. He shows the importance of May 24th, 1738, in Wesley's experience, and then outlines the spiritual pilgrimage of the two brothers both before and subsequent to that date. The views of Dr. Piette and two American writers, Dr. Grant Cell and Dr. Umphrey Lee, are carefully examined, and John's "catholic reversion" discussed. It is a matter of regret that in the last part of the section, "Wesley's Church Beliefs and Practice", Dr. Rattenbury becomes frankly partisan; while he is undoubtedly correct in his account of Wesley's views and habits he errs, in a book of this kind, in having "an axe to grind".

From church architecture Dr. A. L. Drummond has turned to speaking with tongues, and in *Edward Irving and His Circle* (Clarke, 8s. 6d.) he has given us a clear and straightforward account of a character mysterious yet attractive, who, despite his gullibility, wins and holds the sympathy of the reader. Carlyle, who knew Irving as well as any, thus delivers his verdict:

> But for Irving, I had never known what the communion of man with man means. He was the freest, brotherliest, bravest human soul mine ever came in contact with; I call him, on the whole, the best man I have ever, after trial enough, found in this world, or now hope to find.

Carlyle, of course, was well aware of Irving's failings, his singularity and vanity, and the rest; they are revealed in part in his own words, "I love to see an idea *looming through the mist.*" The account of Irving's career is well done; occasionally Dr. Drummond makes his point in an ironic phrase:

> Every Church Court has its weaker brethren who like to air their views in public, especially when there is a large audience.

The psychological section of the book is not equally effective, and attention is needed to pp. 66, 71, 85, and to a sentence duplicated on pp. 236 and 237.

In *Macnab: The Last Laird* (Methuen, 12s. 6d.) Mr. Roland Wild tells the story of Archibald, the 13th Laird of the Clan. Driven from Scotland by debt, Archibald, by bombast, impudence, and fraud, obtained a grant of land from the Canadian Government. He then enticed members of the clan from Scotland, and for many years "got away with it", living as a feudal lord at the expense of the emigrants he had bamboozled. In time their loyalty broke down as they learnt more of his character, and finally his reputation was lost in the Law Courts. He left Canada, settled in the Orkneys, and died in poverty on the French coast in 1860 at the age of 83. Mr. Wild tells us how Macnab's "cheek", hospitality, and unscrupulousness deceived men of all ranks; at this time of day it is hard to see how shrewd, even if uneducated, Highlanders did not see through him from the beginning.

Last quarter we noticed the autobiography of an ex-Chairman of the Congregational Union, Mr. Angus Watson; this quarter we have that of another, the *Memories and Gleanings of My Life* (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.),

by Dr. A. E. Garvie, who in his 76th year retains his vitality and wide interests—writing, reading, drawing on his big fund of stories as if he were half his age. Many readers will value Dr. Garvie's account of his boyhood in Poland; there was laid the foundation for that interest in œcumenical movements which was to occupy so much of his time and thought. Dr. Garvie has not spared himself in the service of the Churches; only by good health and a good brain, an orderly mind and a disciplined spirit, could a man have laboured so abundantly. In this book he surveys this many-sided activity, and Congregationalists especially will enjoy walking along the years with him. This is not the place to criticize, but we wish Dr. Garvie had not committed himself to such a bald statement as:

> But in Independency I have no belief and for it I have no use. Churches must not think of bearing their own burdens.

This appears to suggest that the Independent Churches thought only of bearing their own burdens, for which there is little evidence in any century. We wish, too, that Dr. Garvie's proof-readers had served him better; on the same page we have incorrect initials for his principal and his pastor, and there are other slips of the same kind. But these can be corrected in another edition, and they will not spoil the pleasure of those who have been associated with the author in this enterprise or that, or have sat at his feet or learnt from his books.

All who have read Prof. H. B. Charlton's lectures in the Rylands *Bulletin* during the last eight years will be glad to have them in the volume *Shakespearian Comedy* (Methuen, 10s. 6d.) that they might follow again the course of his argument. It is pleasing to have lectures that are at one and the same time scholarly and human, and those who share Prof. Charlton's distrust of any attempt to make Shakespeare a moralist and a preacher will be the more impressed by his conclusion that the end of Shakespeare's worldly wisdom is "the greatest of these is love". Prof. Charlton's argument is that Shakespeare's comedy developed from *Love's Labours Lost* and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* to its greatest height in *Much Ado, Twelfth Night,* and *As You Like It.* In the course of it he shows the difficulties which emerged when a romantic story was transferred to drama, how there was a recoil from romanticism in *The Taming of the Shrew,* and how Shakespeare began to master his material in *A Midsummer Night's Dream.* The lecture on *The Merchant of Venice,* perhaps the best in the series, maintains that this play cannot be fitted into the romantic march whose chief concern is lovers and wooing. Falstaff gets a lecture to himself, and in the contention that finally he let Shakespeare down Prof. Charlton will find violent opposition. Nor will everybody be convinced that the "Dark Comedies"—*Measure for Measure, All's Well that Ends Well,* and *Troilus and Cressida*—are problem plays by which Shakespeare "climbed from the misleading comedy of Falstaff" to that of the three great plays: he refuses to accept the notion that they are the work of a cynical and disappointed poet whom life has soured: *All's Well* is Shakespeare's escape from the tyranny of Falstaff and from his infectious and rapturous denial of the spiritual life. We warmly commend these lectures to our readers. The note on p. 172 is still in *Bulletin* form, and once or twice Prof. Charlton's sentences caused us trouble: by attaching the word "fairly" to "named" instead of "recently" (p. 161) we were led on a wild goose chase. And is "ennervate" a Manchester spelling?

Mr. Illit Grondahl, the author of *Landmarks of English Literature* (University of London Press, 4s.), is Lecturer in Norwegian in the University of London. This brief survey, prepared for schools, is abundantly

illustrated, and is furnished with questions and suggestions for further reading. It lays undue stress on the moderns; D. H. Lawrence, for example, gets three times as much space as Pepys, and nearly as much as the Brownings.

A very pleasant evening may be spent with Mr. W. J. Blyton's *We Are Observed* (Murray, 7s. 6d.), in which he discusses "characters" in English literature from the Wife of Bath to Mr. Louis Golding's Ben Stern. The chapters vary very much in merit—those on Tennyson and Browning and on "The Woman Who Did" are excellent, that on "The Stiggins Family" weak, despite its tribute to Mark Rutherford (it puts the Clapham Sect in the same category as the "Abode of Love"). There are many misprints, and Mr. Blyton will have to make his peace with Mr. "Edmund Blunder"! The Index is unsatisfactory. Mr. Blyton's introductory chapter is full of good things, as, for example,

> humour can be an over-praised quality: Spenser, Milton, Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Shelley appear to have been without it and yet contrived to be great. . .

Is it possible to teach anybody how to write? We doubt it, but it is possible to point out common errors and easily avoidable mistakes. This Mr. W. N. Brown does in *The Writer's Own Text-book* (Cranton, 3s. 6d.) and, in addition, he gives some sound advice on the writing of articles and books, the way to prepare and submit MSS, and the correction of proofs. If readers would take his advice editors—who are, we are glad to find

> on the whole, a trustworthy and considerate body of men who are earning their living in a perfectly straightforward and honest way—

would be saved a great deal of trouble.

Mr. Stephen Leacock's "Introduction to the Study of Humour", *Humour and Humanity* (Butterworth, 2s. 6d.), is a new volume in the Home University Library. Written by one who has earned his right to discourse on the subject, it is a serious essay, enlivened by numerous examples. The late J. M. Barrie gets an incorrect Christian name on p. 211, the entry not appearing in the Index.

The Senior Lessons Handbook (Ludgate Circus House, 3s. 6d.), which deals with problems of belief and conduct, arrived too late for inclusion in our last issue. Its Editor, Mr. Godfrey Pain, has had the collaboration of Mr. E. H. Hayes and the support of an able team of writers. Leaders of Institutes should find the outlines helpful.

The Rev. Margaret Barr, the author of *The Great Unity* (Lindsey Press, 1s. 6d.), is a Unitarian minister. She outlines a course of religious instruction in the Gokhale Girls' School in Calcutta, a non-sectarian school including among its pupils Hindus, Brahmins, and Muslims. The course is extremely interesting and deserves careful study.

Mr. E. E. Reynolds's *Freedom to Mature* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.) is a sane and practical "View of Education" in which he draws on 15 years' experience in Secondary Schools and 20 years' activity in the Scout Movement. His title is taken from Robert Bridges's "freedom to mature the personality"; to him

> the first function of education may be defined as the provision of, and the means for getting, any information needed; the second as training in the use of information.

Like all educationalists Mr. Reynolds sees the dual system as an obstacle, and the timidity and indifference of Parliament as another. About methods of teaching, the use of new aids, organization, and administration, he has

much to say that is wise; rather regrettably he joins in the indiscriminate abuse of examinations, about the only part of the book where he failed to carry conviction. Teachers and all interested in education ought to read this volume.

St. Paul's Cathedral, London, Then and Now (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.) is an acceptable guide by Mr. A. E. Henderson, who provides drawings of the past and present cathedrals, reinforcing these illustrations with some exceptionally good photographs.

Mr. W. S. Powell's *Son of David* (Lane, 7s. 6d.) is still another attempt to reconstruct the life of Jesus by the aid of a reverent imagination. It tells the story of his life in Nazareth until the beginning of the ministry—of his experience in the workshop, in "the street of the harlots", on the hills, and on the road to Jerusalem. It would be unfair to tell how Mr. Powell describes the awakening of Jesus to life and love and duty and God. We liked the book much better than we thought possible at the beginning; indeed it is on the whole extremely well done; occasionally Mr. Powell uses words strangely, but in his reconstruction his instinct is sound and he never goes astray.

In *Head in Green Bronze* (Macmillan, 8s. 6d.) Sir Hugh Walpole has given us a fine miscellaneous collection of short stories. There are some of his excursions into the supernatural, which are not Sir Hugh at his best, and there are seven of the adventures of Boniface & Co., who, for a modest fee, undertake to remove bores. Two dog stories are well done; two child stories proclaim Sir Hugh's insight into the *genus* boy; and those who love Lakeland and the Herries family will not open the volume in vain. In short, an interesting volume.

Mrs. C. F. Cushman's *This Side of Regret* (Methuen, 7s. 6d.) is one of the best novels we have read for some time. Its four main characters—Ann, Tillie, Stephen, and Kerry—are admirably drawn: they are alive and real from the beginning to the end. The "gold mine" is a mistake, and the one blemish in the book.

We do not think Mr. Sinclair Lewis has done anything better than *The Prodigal Parents* (Cape, 7s. 6d.), in which he describes how the very likeable Fred and Hazel Cornplow, of Main Street, escape from two domineering children, who have grown up to despise even while they sponge on them. The four Cornplows and the minor characters are admirably drawn, and Mr. Lewis's cynical humour throws a lurid light on family life in America today. It is a pleasure, too, to read a novel that is not "sexy", and has some really decent people in it. Fred and Hazel are "good sorts", and so is Annabel (though how she came to marry Howard is beyond us!); Sara is a nasty piece of goods; her impudence in taking her father to see a psychotherapist is colossal, and the account of the interview is Mr. Lewis at his best.

Herr Emil Ludwig's *Cleopatra* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.) he calls an "unquiet history . . . dedicated almost entirely to the psychological life of the heroine and her three Romans". It is "unquiet" all right, but we do not know about its being "history"! With Plutarch as his master, and little in the way of documents to restrain him, Herr Ludwig has, if we may be colloquial, "the time of his life", giving colour to a story already crimson and purple enough. The most unpleasant person in the story, to the writer's eyes, is Octavian, while the young Caesarion wins the reader's sympathy. Those who like a good novel will enjoy this book, which has "certanly" on p. 212.

Mr. Rufus King's *The Case of the Constant God* (Methuen, 7s. 6d.) is very short, but it is a very good thriller. If readers are as obtuse as we were, it will "have them beat". We will not spoil anybody's pleasure by telling the story of "Lieutenant Valcour's Most Exciting Case", but merely commend the book.

We were among the many who put off going to see Barrie's *The Boy David* until it was announced it was to be taken off, and then in the last three weeks found it impossible to obtain a seat. In the Introduction to the play, now printed (Davies, 7s. 6d. & 5s.), H. G-B. tells us that Barrie was grievously disappointed at the critical reception of the play, and that illness kept him from the final rehearsals. Here, probably, is the explanation of the play's failure; parts of it are Barrie at his best, but Barrie at his best would have discovered some other technique than David's six visions in Act III, which, in any case, assume a knowledge of the Bible narrative to make them intelligible. The play just needs that "little more" to make it "come off" as did *Peter Pan* and *Dear Brutus*.

Mr. R. H. Ward has edited *Ten Peace Plays* (Dent, 5s.), four of which are by women, six by men. They vary greatly, some of them being as effective as plays as they are poor as propaganda, and some *vice versa*. Emphasis on horrors does not strike us as effective: a woman's play about life in wartime London in 1970 and the *débâcle* it produces in minds and morals leaves us unmoved. In the plays there is a good deal of caustic irony about the human race, and in Mr. Anthony Armstrong's "Eleventh Hour" an eleventh hour surprise.

Mr. Dan Burke's play, *Van Gogh* (Constable, 2s. 6d.), deals with the last years of the painter's short, full, and unhappy life. We did not see the play when performed at the Arts Theatre last September: it makes great demands on the actors, but it reads well, and might easily be very successful. The Church fares as badly as usual on the stage.

Mr. St. John Ervine's comedy, *Robert's Wife* (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d.), is now playing at the Globe Theatre, London. An admirable vicar, likely to be made a Dean, his second wife (a doctor, who runs a clinic), his son, a young pacifist who is imprisoned for sedition, a likeable and sensible Bishop (how rarely the Church comes off so well in a play!)—these are the main characters. "Can the wife of a Church dignitary have a career? And what if the callings of husband and wife clash?" These problems are skilfully handled, and the end of the play is unusually good.

Here are three books just to hand as we go to press:

Canon T. W. Pym is very concerned at the apathy of the Church of England about sex morality. Nothing has been done by the Bishops to follow up what was said at the Lambeth Conference in 1930, though the pronouncements then were ten years late and the Church has since fallen further behind because of the increased knowledge and use of contraceptives. He has therefore written *Sex and Sense* (Nicholson & Watson, 2s. 6d.), in which he pleads warmly and wisely for sex education and for an honest tackling by the Church of a difficult and urgent situation. The Introduction and the chapter on "Marriage" are extremely good, but they are followed by chapters on "Masturbation" and "Homosexuality" which we feel to be a mistake in a book of this kind; the extent of both is greatly exaggerated.

It was a happy thought on somebody's part to gather together a selection of *Recollections and Appreciations* (Epworth Press, 6s.), which A. S. Peake wrote for the *Holborn Review*. We have spent a very pleasant evening with the volume, though its contents were familiar to us, and we eagerly await a promised volume illustrated from his letters and from the

reminiscences of his friends. Most of the present volume is given to biblical scholars, though we have two great editors (Nicoll and Hastings), an Oxford triumvirate (Sanday, Cheyne, and Driver), and a collection of general appreciations which include Alexander Whyte, P. T. Forsyth, and J. H. Jowett.

Mr. Clarence R. Skinner's *Liberalism Faces the Future* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.) is the result of a discussion at the Leyden International Bureau, Isles of Shoals, New Hampshire, on "The Function of Liberalism in a World of Authorities". Without going very deep the book is very timely and is well worth reading. All people looking longingly to authoritarianism in religious and political life would be well advised to read this volume.

EDITOR.

Dr. Thomas Walker's *Is not this the son of Joseph?* (Clarke, 3s. 6d.), an exposition of the relevant chapters of the Gospels in the light of Jewish culture, is a reverent and studious attempt to show that the earliest form of the stories of the birth of Jesus regarded Joseph as his father. It is evident that even when full use has been made of the variant readings of the Sinaitic Syriac version and of contemporary references to Jesus as the son of Joseph, there must have been drastic alteration of this (alleged) original text in order to yield that which now stands in the Greek Gospels. The author does not shrink from supposing that this has taken place, and he selects Antioch as the scene of the operation, with "Ignatius or someone like him" as the villain of the piece. The book is honest and industrious but not very convincing.

Dr. Adolph Lichtigfeld's *Twenty Centuries of Jewish Thought* (Beck, 2s. 6d.), an anthology of passages by Jews concerning Judaism, contains a good deal of interesting matter, but it is not at all well-arranged and there is considerable cross-division amongst its sections. It is also difficult to know where the author is simply summarizing or quoting, which is always a bad fault in an anthology, as it makes it impossible to use the book with confidence. It is a pity that better use has not been made of the opportunity, especially as there is such a wealth of material. The sections on both the Talmud and the newer Judaism are too brief, especially the latter. Altogether, the book shows that want of balance and perspective which too often characterizes Jewish writers.

The Rev. F. E. Coggin's *The Second Story of Genesis as Literature* (Heffer, 2s. 6d.), which continues a similar one dealing with the first chapter of *Genesis*, covers *Genesis* 2^4-4^{26}, of which it gives a translation with some notes on the Hebrew text, accompanied by what might be called a meditative Midrash. This includes a number of suggestive ideas which preachers might find of use, but certainly reads a good deal of post-biblical meaning into the Hebrew text and is too much inclined to resort to symbolism.

H. WHEELER ROBINSON.

Dr. F. E. England has done some good work on the psychology and philosophy of religion, and his new book—*The Validity of Religious Experience* (Nicholson & Watson, 8s. 6d.)—is a very real contribution on an important and difficult subject. His aim is to offer a solid, that is objective, basis for religious conviction both in the realms of metaphysics and epistemology. In order to do this he attempts to relate religious experience organically to the rest of reality by showing the relation of human personality to reality as a whole, and then by a psychological analysis of the experience in question. He then seeks to show the inadequacy of various subjective explanations of religious experience, and

this is a very valuable part of his book. But its real importance lies in his discussion of the content of religious experience and in his positive and constructive argument. In this he shares a good deal of ground in common with Prof. Whitehead, but his conclusions are more definite both in the theistic and the Christian direction. His book will appeal to all those who are interested in ultimate religious problems and is a welcome and notable contribution to the International Library of Christian Knowledge.

Dr. Georgia Harkness is Professor of Philosophy in Elmira College, U.S.A. But she is something of a theologian as well as a philosopher, and in *The Recovery of Ideals* (Scribners, 7s. 6d.) she sets forth an empirical philosophy of religion as the best means not only of recovering ideals, but of fitting the coming generation to solve the problems with which it is confronted. Dr. Harkness believes that the present generation of youth is neither better nor worse than any former generation, but it is more confused—"it is a bewildered, shell-shocked, lost generation, pitied and but feebly served by an almost equally bewildered and confused older generation". The trouble is that there is now no centre of stability. Men and women are losing both hope and courage and have discovered no new moorings to take the place of those they have lost. Dr. Harkness then goes on to argue that the best means of stabilizing life is personal religious experience. This, however, is beset with difficulties because religion has often meant and still means a great many bad things. The religious idealism which she then proceeds to expound is at least free from the difficulties inherent in much orthodox religion and offers a very timely and sensible scheme of human redemption. Dr. Harkness covers a great deal of ground and deals with a great many big questions. She has something lively and interesting to say about them all, and her general conclusion as to the necessity of religion for sane human living and as to the kind of religion which best meets fundamental human needs will be generally accepted.

The lamentable death of Professor J. L. Stocks removed from among us a thinker and teacher of singular power and attraction before he had time to put his work into anything like permanent form. We cannot therefore but be grateful to those who have published the Forwood Lectures which Prof. Stocks gave at Liverpool in 1935—to Prof. Alexander for seeing the lectures through the press, and to the Archbishop of York, who writes an introduction. *Time, Cause and Eternity* (Macmillan, 6s.) abundantly illustrates the penetration and clarity of Stocks's mind and the persuasiveness of his presentation. In dealing with Time and Causation he begins with the Greek view given in Plato and Aristotle, and then passes on to the modern view—scientific, historical, and metaphysical. The third lecture is constructive and leads up to certain conclusions which may be stated in Stocks's own words:

> When spirit has been shown to be eternal, the eternity of spiritual values ceases to need further proof. The only kind of eternity which has any real significance either for religion or for anything else and is worth fighting either for or against by logical or other weapons, is an eternal which is in causal relation with the temporal,

and he adds, "it is such an eternal that I have tried to expound and defend". The process by which this conclusion is reached is one which students of philosophy will find worth while following up. Stocks deals with the big questions that he raises in a big way, and, as the Archbishop of York says, "his lectures deserve the careful attention of all who care for serious thinking".

Mr. F. S. Marvin's *The New Vision of Man* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) is really a new version of the religion of humanity. The writer is quite definitely a follower of Auguste Comte and seeks to deepen and carry on his work under modern conditions. Humanity in his view stands for certain characteristics, qualities, and powers belonging to the human race as such. History has been moulded by them, and they are capable of moulding the future. The human race, therefore, stands at once for an ideal and for the means by which it is to be realized. All this Mr. Marvin illustrates from a study of physical growth of man, from science, civilization, the art of government, morals, and aesthetics. He believes in an inevitable progress and in the capability of humanity to work out its own salvation if only it is given the opportunity. It is all familiar enough, and there is no better presentation of the case for humanism than is to be found in Mr. Marvin's persuasive and attractive writing. Two things need to be said in criticism. First, it is all too easy. There is a dark side to human nature, and the working of the group consciousness is by no means always for good. Whatever we may think of the term original sin, it stands for a grim reality, and humanists generally are too much inclined to ignore it. In the next place, humanism cannot be turned into a religion by clothing it with religious attributes and using language in connexion with it of a religious nature. It still lacks the dynamic, the incentive, and the driving force which religion alone can bring into human action. When left to itself we can only say that humanism is not enough.

W. B. Selbie.

For a long time it was thought by most scientists that they could deal with bare facts and make light of all philosophy as no better than word-spinning. But it is not clear now that there are any bare facts, and science is being driven to ask what kind of ground it stands on. Messrs. J. W. Friend and J. Feibleman discuss these matters in their *What Science Really Means* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) They do not entirely succeed in their effort to make an ordinary reader understand all the intricacies of the question, but they will at least save him from many pitfalls. They do not accept the idealism, say, of Sir James Jeans, nor the orthodox positivism which has ruled in the science schools; instead they offer a kind of realism. The real subject-matter of science is not in facts but function. I suppose this means that in a simple statement like $y=f(x)$ what is real is not the y or the x but an invariant relation or function. This may be so; but no one ever yet got hold of a function except as a product of the mind, and when the affair is duly considered it seems not so far from a masked idealism. The reader will find this book fully alive. And if it raises more questions than it answers, it is none the worse for that.

The Rev. James S. Stewart's *The Gates of New Life* (Clark, 7s.) is the latest volume in "The Scholar as Preacher" series. These are good sermons, carefully thought out, and in several cases well illustrated; they could not but have a generous influence on a congregation. Somehow one wishes that the scholar in the pulpit would forget that he is a scholar and be content to be a man. Some of these sermons succeed in doing this, and then the preacher is at his best; and he is often enough at his best to make this a very welcome volume.

Mr. Syed Mehdi Imam's *The Poetry of the Invisible* (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.) claims to be an interpretation of the major English poets from Keats to Bridges. It is hardly that, but is rather an attempt to trace in these poets justifications of the Oriental mysticism which Mr. Imam himself holds. Perhaps the author finds too easily what he is looking for. But

the book is very interesting, and discloses a very intimate knowledge of English poetry. It is a book one can thoroughly enjoy for literary qualities of its own.

The myths and legends of early Greece keep a freshness which nothing can stale, and we turn back to them to-day with a strange delight. To the Greek race they were more than fairy tales for children; they came to have a deep significance and counted in the life and education of the people. Mrs. Jocelyn M. Woodward's *Perseus: A Study in Greek Art and Legend* (Cambridge Press, 10s. 6d.) deals only with the one legend of Perseus, illustrating the many forms which it took with quotations from various Greek authors, and by a study of the paintings on Greek vases. There are some thirty or more reproductions of these vases taken from European collections, including the British Museum. The reproductions are very good, and they show not only the growth of the legend but also the art of vase painting as it developed among the Greeks. To each illustration there is a page or so of explanatory comment, which one is grateful to find is intended for the ordinary reader rather than the classical expert. At the end of the book is a list of vases, *etc.*, in the British Museum, for comparison with the examples given. This is a very attractive book and it is admirably produced. One quotation I must find room for, "Writers of a later, critical age," says Mrs. Woodward, "try to rationalize the story, but their laboured explanations are far more fantastic than any myth."

Professor H. Levy's *A Philosophy for a Modern Man* (Gollancz, 7s. 6d.) is without disguise a "Left" book; its philosophy is a materialism leading up to what is little else but a Soviet republic. Any other philosophy is dismissed out of hand as based on fictitious ideas; the arguments against materialism are hardly considered. The modern man appears as a common-sense fellow who is not to be taken in by idealism. Those who can accept Prof. Levy's philosophy will have a comfortable journey through the book. It is a pity though that there is not a more balanced judgment of opposite views. Is an argument from physics and mathematics an adequate groundwork for a social science? It is not that this physical element has not much in it that is true; but confined to itself it leaves so much else out that goes to make up humanity.

Having said this much by way of criticism, it must also be said that on its scientific side the book is both very able and very interesting. But when it comes to man's hopes and dreams, and his sufferings and wrongs, something more than science is needed.

Dr. G. D. Rosenthal's *Sins of the Saints* (Centenary Press 5s.) treats of the commonplace faults and sins of good people: bad temper, depression, ingratitude, to mention some of them; sins which are frequently never thought of as sins. There is a healthy common sense in these sermons, and often a touch of kindly humour. They have an evangelical spirit; they appeal by their sincerity and their understanding of men.

Dr. Iddings Bell's *In the City of Confusion* (Centenary Press, 3s. 6d.) is a series of devotional papers for Lent. Used as a basis of meditation they will be very helpful. They belong to the Catholic school, and have a Catholic sentiment, but they will be read with much profit by many whose religious life has a different emphasis. A thoroughly good Lent book.

A. T. S. James.

Dr. H. J. Wotherspoon died in 1930, having retired from parish ministry in the Church of Scotland in 1923, after having preached the Gospel for nearly half a century. For 14 years he had worked among the colliers at Hamilton, Lanarkshire, and for 29 years in the parish of St. Oswald's,

Edinburgh. Distinguished as a student, he became a scholarly minister with a keen concern for the Catholic character of the Church of Scotland, and published books dealing mainly with the Ministry and the Sacraments. *What Happened at Pentecost* (Clark, 5s.) consists mainly of a selection of his addresses at devotional Conferences. The first six of them give the title to the collection as a whole. The writer insists that the gift of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost constitutes a unique, supernatural fact, and not a mere extension of His activity among men before the Incarnation. The Spirit, completely united with Christ, is united with manhood in the Incarnation, but this union only becomes complete when man's redemption is completed, *i.e.*, after the Resurrection and Ascension. Thus Pentecost completes redemption, and the ministration of the Spirit becomes the rule of Christ in the Church, His Body.

Other addresses concern the Trinity, Universal Priesthood, Worship, the Church as an Ethical Society, and the use of Sign and Symbol in worship. There are four addresses on the Devotional Life and various aspects of Prayer which will be found very helpful and suggestive by preachers and teachers as well as by Christians in general. They are the rich product of a many-sided pastoral experience.

Inspired by the Archbishop's "Recall to Religion," the Rev. E. H. Rudkin's *The Religion of the Incarnation* (Skeffington, 6s.) consists of twenty-one addresses on selected subjects concerning Christian doctrine and personal belief. It is the writer's conviction that the future of the Anglican Church and her influence in the world depend upon her power "to deliver a clear incisive message and announce it with striking effect." He hopes that his book will be of value for purposes of group-study, as well as for sermon-making. His aim is not to be exhaustive, but suggestive—to hint at fruitful lines of thought without working them out in detail. The book is intended for Anglicans, and occasionally the ecclesiastical prejudices of the writer peep forth, *e.g.*, "The use of the word 'Church' should be restricted to religious Communions which have the marks of true Catholicity" p. 247. Non-episcopally ordained ministers are not Catholic (pp. 150-1) and that apparently is sufficient reason for their rejection. On p. 156, Hort's view of the Greek meaning of the term "ecclesia" is misinterpreted. There are some careless sentences, actually ungrammatical in form; *e.g.*, on pp. 63 and 101. Something seems to have gone wrong with the sentence about electrons on p. 137, while it is surprising to be informed on p. 127 that it was the Samaritan who fell among thieves. Apart from these blemishes the book should serve a useful purpose in suggesting concrete lines of thought for preaching.

E. J. Price.

The Rev. Robert Munson Grey's *I, Yahweh, A Novel in the Form of an Autobiography* (Chicago: Willett, Clark, $2.50), is an ingenious, not to say entertaining, history. Purporting to be an autobiography of God, it turns out to be an account of the development of the human idea of God. Its fascination lies in the fact that the human idea constantly appears as God Himself—precisely as it has done through the generations. "Yahweh" makes his start as a tribal god of war. The last pages reveal him today as —not much more. Mr. Grey, the author, a Congregational minister in Massachusetts, writes English in the most engaging way.

D. Horton.

NEW EDITIONS, REPRINTS, *ETC.*

The Rev. Cyril Bache's *Winged Words* (Lutterworth Press, 1s.) consists of articles reprinted from *The Mombasa Times*, in which "a padre lets fly". Mr. John Oxenham writes a Foreword. The Rev. E. W. Smith's *The*

Secret of the African (U.S.C.L., 2s. 6d.), first published in 1929, has now gone into its third edition. Incredible as it seems, it is nearly sixteen years since the publication of Dr. G. M. Trevelyan's *British History in the Nineteenth Century*. In that volume he brought the story down to 1901. In the new edition (Longmans, 12s. 6d.) he has added an Epilogue dealing with the years to the end of the War. The new chapters are marked by the same characteristics as the rest of the book; they are, in large measure, a championship of Grey and his policy. Something has gone wrong with a sentence on p. 428, and on p. 470 we have "1919" for "1918".

LECTURES, PAMPHLETS, *ETC.*

"Come, Follow" (Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 6d.) consists of chapters on the Missionary vocation by Miss Mildred Cable and others. Three more "On the Spot" Booklets (Livingstone Press, 3d.) are H. F. Wickings's *Adventurous Evangelism,* H. V. Martin's *Among the Madigas,* and E. M. Pateman's *Coral Island Community,* while from the same publishers comes *The Way and Its Heroes* (1s.), by Mary Entwistle and Elsie H. Spriggs, ten very good missionary stories based on the sayings of Jesus. Dr. L. F. Browne's *Everyday Relationships* (S.C.M., 1s. 6d.) contains five useful talks recently broadcast by the physician to the Tavistock Clinic. *The World's Need of Religion: Its Value to the World* is an address delivered by the Begum Sultan Mir Amiruddin, a contributor to our pages, to the World Congress of Faiths at Oxford last July. Two very useful pamphlets are the Rev. T. F. Kinloch's *Religious Education in Provided Schools* (Oxford Press, 1s.) and "An English Christian's" *The Church Struggle in Germany* (Kulturkampf Association, 6d.). The Rev. F. J. Smithen's *Presbyterianism in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (Manchester: Aikman, 1s.) is a useful summary.

ALSO RECEIVED.

PHILEMON MOORE. *Prayers.* Lindsey Press. 1s. 6d.

G. M. DRYBURGH. *The Making of a Christian.* S.C.M. 2s. 6d. Studies in the Christian Life for Bible Classes, Fellowships, and Study Circles, written at the request of the Youth Committee of the Church of Scotland.

R. W. THOMSON. *Heroes of the Baptist Church.* Kingsgate Press. 2s. The sketches include Smyth, Keach, Ryland, Robert Hall, Carey, Knibb, Roger Williams, Timothy Richard, J. H. Shakespeare, Spurgeon, and Clifford.

HENRY COOK. *Baa, Baa, Black Sheep!* Carey Press. 2s. 6d. Twenty addresses on nursery rhymes by the minister of the Ferme Park Baptist Church, London.

A. H. BURTON. *Windows on the World.* Pickering. 2s. 6d.

D. M. MCINTYRE. *Christ the Life;* H. LOCKYER. *The Rapture of Saints;* JAMES STEPHEN. *Twelve Famous Evangelists;* D. G. BARNHOUSE. *Happy though Poor;* ANN MILLER. *A Year with the Naismiths.* Pickering. 1s. each.

C. H. TITTERTON. *Arab and Jew in Prophecy and History.* Pickering. 6d.

HEBE SPAULL. *Czechoslovakia.* S.C.M. 1s. 6d. In the "Life in Other Lands" Series.

SID. G. HEDGES. *Hohner Harmonica Band Book.* Pilgrim Press. 1s.

G. L. HILL *White Orchids.* Lippincott. 7s. 6d.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review (January). The Rev. Atkinson Lee writes on "The German Protestants and the Life and Work Movement", while Mr. E. E. Kellett draws from his very wide reading in a fascinating article on "Marginal Comments". The Rev. C. T. Groves discusses "Song and Schubert" and the Rev. Alexander Dimond writes on the Church "Likened to a Crystal". Among other articles which are worthy of attention are Dr. W. F. Howard's "Some Recent Foreign Contributions to New Testament Study", and Col. C. B. Thackeray's "God and Mrs. Woolf".

The Hibbert Journal (January). Prof. John Murray discusses "The Human Basis of the League of Nations", and Prof. R. B. Mowat "Religion as a Factor in Human History". A doctor argues that intelligence is declining in Western civilization, and Miss M. E. Thornton champions "Sport as a Medium of International Friendship". Other articles we have found of special interest are the Roman Catholic comment on the Edinburgh Conference, Prof. C. J. Wright's "The Abiding Significance of the Reformation", Prof. A. H. Dodd's "The Nonconformist Conscience" (in which he scarcely does justice to the sincerity of many "passive resisters"), and the Rev. J. M. Connell's "The Religion of Charles Dickens".

The Baptist Quarterly (January). The Rev. Gilbert Laws writes on the Edinburgh Conference, Prin. Wheeler Robinson on "Thirty Years in the Sermon Class", Dr. Whitley on "Early Education in New England", and the Rev. F. T. Bloice Smith on "The Problem of Suffering".

The Layman (January). Mr. Seymour J. Price tells of his recent visit to Jamaica, Mr. J. H. Maynard of "A Mission Outpost in the Cameroons", and the Rev. E. W. Burt of "The War in the Far East—Its Causes and Consequences". There are some more pages from Mr. T. S. Penny's diary.

The Modern Churchman (Dec.-Feb.). The Bishop of Durham argues for the retention and revision of the Thirty-Nine Articles, the Rev. Alan Richardson writes on "The Churches and the Problem of the State", the Rev. H. T. L. Lees on Kierkegaard, while the Rev. L. J. Collins has "An Estimation of the Importance of the Work of Monsieur Loisy".

The Expository Times (Jan.-March.). The Rev. H. L. Johnston writes on Canon Sheppard and the Rev. J. C. Hardwick on Dr. Streeter. Congregational contributions are Prof. Lovell Cocks's "The Place of the Sermon in Worship" and Dr. Garvie's "Recent Foreign Theology". "Old Texts in Modern Translations" are dealt with by Dr. James Reid, the Rev. J. S. Stewart, and Dr. Wheeler Robinson. Articles on worship are by Dr. D. H. Hislop and Dr. Harold Roberts.

Friends' Quarterly Examiner (Tenth Month, 1937, First Month, 1938). "From the House of the Four Winds" is devoted to a description of the Friends' World Conference, Plutarch, Ramsay MacDonald, and Dick Sheppard. Among other articles are Caroline Graveson's "A New Venture in Quaker Education", Evelyn Clark's "The Task of the Christian Church in the World To-day", Reginald E. Witt's "Bach: The Quaker Musician", and a very useful list of Quaker contributions to Medicine and Public Health.

The International Review of Missions (January). Most of this number is occupied by the Editor's Survey of the Year 1937, an invaluable conspectus of missionary enterprise at the present time. Dr. J. T. Addison discusses "The Changing Attitude toward non-Christian Religions", and Dr. S. Knak "Guidance and Experience".

World Dominion (January). The Editor tells of his friend S. J. W. Clark, Dr. Nicholas Arseniev writes on "The Religious Situation in Soviet Russia", and Mr. Maurice Whitlow begins a report on "This London", dealing especially this quarter with "over-the-border" cities. Mr. Albert Abramson's "Partition Scheme for Palestine" is important and so is the Rev. T. S. Soltau's "A 'Church on Fire' in Korea".

The Evangelical Quarterly (January). Dr. Hugh Watt writes on Lord Eustace Percy's *John Knox*, and there is a very good article on "Apostolic Succession" by Dr. R. J. Drummond. Pastor Étienne de Peyer discusses "Calvin's Doctrine of Divine Providence", and Prof. Louis Imre "Theology and Church-Life".

Social Service Review (Dec.-Feb.). The main articles deal with Children's Care Committee work in London, the Report of the Commissioner for the Special Areas, and the Annual Report of the Tyneside Council of Social Service.

Religion in Education (January). Dr. Selbie writes on "The Bible in English Life", Dr. J. M. Creed on "The Teaching of the New Testament in Schools", Dr. Paul Levertoff on "The Infant Church", and Dr. W. F. Lofthouse on "Sacrifice and Reconciliation". A valuable article is Dr. A. Mitchell Hunter's "The Educational Work of John Calvin" to which reference is made in the Editorial.

The Yale Review (Winter). Scarcely up to its standard, we think. Sir Arthur Salter's "The Perils of Recovery", is well worth reading. Mr. Grover Clark's "Questions about Japan" looks backward rather than forward. A good many articles deal with American political and economic problems, and the stories are not so fresh as the *Yale* generally gives us.

The Review of Religion (January, 1938). Mr. P. M. Grant writes on "The Sacrament of Initiation", while Prof. Karl Barth has an informing study on "Christianity in Germany". Father Cornelius Clifford discusses "Modernism, Father George Tyrrell, and Miss M. D. Petre", and Prof. H. W. Schneider writes on "Theology and Science in Contemporary Idealism", and Dr. E. G. Homrighausen on "The Significance of the Oxford Conference".

Religion in Life (Winter). The first six articles of this number are concerned with the Edinburgh and Oxford Conferences; they are by Dr. Adams Brown, Dr. E. F. Tittle, Dr. H. F. Rall, Mr. J. F. Dulles, the Rev. William Paton, and Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin. Among the other articles are Dr. C. A. Ellwood's "The Function of the Church-Related College in Our System of Education", and Dr. H. T. Kerr's "An Interpretation of Karl Heim".

Anglican Theological Review (January). The Church Congress Syllabus is continued, the subject being "The Content of and Authority for Christian Evangelism". The Rev. H. E. Dana answers the question "Where Did Paul Persecute the Church?", and Dr. W. Norman Pittenger writes on "The Christology of the German Crisis-Theology".

The Harvard Theological Review (October). This number contains the Index of this review since its inception in 1908. The three articles are Prof. Sterling Dow's "The Egyptian Cults in Athens", Mr. R. L. Wolff's "The Apology of Aristides—A Re-Examination", and Mr. Ralph Marcus's "The 'Plain Meaning' of Isaiah 42$^{1-4}$".

(January). There is an unusual literary touch about this number. Mr. Grant McColley shows how Milton used the Book of Enoch in *Paradise Lost*. Mr. Marbury B. Ogle discusses the use of the phrase "The Way of all Flesh" in the Bible and in literature, and Mr. Theodore Silverstein "The Passage of the Souls to Purgatory in the *Divina Commedia*". There are some notes on "Hermetica" in a French article by the Rev. A. J. Festugière, and "A Fragment of the Acta Pauli in the Michigan Collection" is described by Mr. H. A. Sanders.

The Review and Expositor (January). Dr. J. L. Rosser describes Dr. G. W. Truett, preacher. Other articles deal with "The Education that is needed in To-day's World" (Dr. W. R. Cullom), and "The Jewish Day of Atonement" (Mr. Jacob Gartenhaus). Other contributions are in the nature of sermons and expositions.

The Colgate-Rochester Divinity School Bulletin (December). The articles, "Rhode Island and Democracy", by Dr. O. B. Judd, and "The Communion of Saints", by the Rev. H. B. Robins, are valuable historically.

World Christianity (First Quarter). These digests are useful, but it is to be hoped that they will be used to stimulate further reading and not as a substitute for it. One of the most interesting articles is Dr. A. W. Palmer's "What Hope for a United Protestantism in the United States?"

In Extremis (Nos. 7-8) contain a long article by Dr. Karl Ludwig Schmidt on the fact and bearing of the historicity of Jesus and a study by Hans Zindel of Don Quixote and Dostoievsky's Idiot as prophetic types. The editor discusses the relations of dogma and behaviour, and there is a Christmas sermon by Eduard Thurneysen.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the *Congregational Quarterly*,

Sir,

In the notice of my book *The Credibility of the Christian Faith*, your reviewer states that the author "dismisses the Roman case as impossible". I must ask your permission to correct that statement. It is not true, and I am entirely at a loss to understand what phrase in the book could possibly be misunderstood in that way. The whole trend of the book points to the conclusion that the Roman case is more than possible, is the most probable of the conclusions allowed as possible.

Yours faithfully,

H. S. SHELTON.

Our reviewer writes:

I am very sorry if the phrase, "dismisses the Roman case as impossible" seems to Mr. Shelton unfair; but in the upshot that is what the "detached inquirer" of his book makes of the case. The phrase is perhaps too compressed; it would have been better if it had read, "the detached inquirer finds the Roman case impossible to accept—impossible, in spite of all that can be said for it". I did take this, with some surprise, to be Mr. Shelton's own conclusion; for the book has a profoundly Roman sympathy all through, and is in effect a piece of Roman apologetic. If Mr. Shelton really believes that Rome's case is the most probable I think, with much respect, that he would have done very much better to say so.

A. T. S. J.